

JOHN SHAW,
STOCK AND SHARE DEALER.
HEAD OFFICE:—WARDROBE CHAMBERS, DOCTORS'
COMMONS, LONDON, E.C.

BRANCHES AT—
165, Queen Victoria-street, E.C.
19 and 20, Railway-approach, London Bridge, S.E.
1, The Facade, Northumberland-avenue, S.W.
8, Haymarket, S.W.
174, Victoria-street, S.W.
62 and 63, New Bond-street, W.
18, Westbourne-grove, W.
65, Fenchurch-street, E.C.
45, New Oxford-street, W.
181a, Sloane-street, S.W.
69, Ship-street, Brighton.
24 and 25, North-street, Brighton.
6, Brown-street, Manchester.
22, Westmoreland-street, Dublin.

MANUAL OF TRUST INVESTMENTS.

For the use of Trustees JOHN SHAW has compiled his
MANUAL OF TRUST INVESTMENTS,
giving a full list of all Stocks in which Trustees can invest.

JOHN SHAW'S Manual of Trust Investments.
" " Monthly Investment List.
" " Highest and Lowest for past 5 years.
" " Traffic Book.

Any of the above will be sent free by post on application.

NEW EDITIONS NOW READY.

LEGAL AND GENERAL LIFE ASSURANCE
SOCIETY.

ESTABLISHED OVER HALF CENTURY.

10, FLEET STREET, LONDON.

FREE,
SIMPLE,

THE
PERFECTED
OF
LIFE
ASSURANCE.
AND
SECURE.

TOTAL ASSETS, £2,692,000. INCOME, £30,000.

The Yearly New Business exceeds ONE MILLION.

TRUSTEES.

The Right Hon. Lord HALSBURY, The Lord Chancellor.
The Right Hon. Lord COLERIDGE, The Lord Chief Justice.
The Hon. Mr. Justice KEKEWICH.
Sir JAMES PARKER DEANE, Q.C., D.C.L.
FREDERICK JOHN BLAKE, Esq.
WILLIAM WILLIAMS, Esq.

VOL. XXXVII., No. 31.
The Solicitors' Journal and Reporter.
LONDON, JUNE 3, 1893.

Contents.

CURRENT TOPICS.....	519	THE PRACTICAL WORKING OF THE LAND TRANSFER BILL.....	528
THE SUPREME COURT OF JUDICATURE BILL.....	521	LAW SOCIETIES.....	529
SERVICES UPON FOREIGN FIRMS AND INDIVIDUALS.....	522	LAW STUDENTS' JOURNAL.....	530
LEGISLATION IN PROGRESS.....	523	LEGAL NEWS.....	530
THE COUNCIL OF THE INCORPORATED LAW SOCIETY.....	524	COURT PAPERS.....	531
REVIEWS.....	524	WINDING UP NOTICES.....	534
NEW ORDERS, &c.	525	CREDITORS' NOTICES.....	535
		BANKRUPTCY NOTICES.....	535

Cases Reported this Week.

In the Solicitors' Journal.

A Solicitor, Re, Ex parte The Incorporated Law Society.....	527	Dougal v. McCarthy.....	484
An Arbitration between Bater and Another and the Mayor, &c., of Birkenhead, Re.....	525	Driver v. Broad.....	485
Apkin (Appellant); Porritt and Others (Respondents).....	526	Ellis v. Plumstead Board of Works ...	496
Browns v. Hart.....	525	Firth & Sons v. Palmer and De Las Rivas.....	493
Goodier v. Edmunds.....	526	Hengler, In re, Frowde v. Hengler.....	491
Maxim Nordenfeldt Gun, &c., Co. (Lim.) v. Nordenfeldt.....	526	Lester & Co., Ex parte, In re Hannah Lynes.....	496
R. A. Stuart, Re	527	Neck v. Taylor	490

In the Weekly Reporter.

Brighton Marine, &c., Co. v. Woodhouse.....	483	Pioneers of Mashonaland Syndicate (Limited), In re.....	492
De Bernales v. "New York Herald"	481	Roberts v. Holland and Others.....	494
		Williams v. Jenkins.....	499
		Wilson, Sons, & Co. (Limited) v. Balcarres Brook Steamship Co. (Limited)	495

CURRENT TOPICS.

THERE WAS a very full attendance of judges on the opening day of the Trinity Sittings; as many as twenty-six sitting in the various courts. The only absentee was Mr. Justice North, who was also absent on the second day, and did not sit until Thursday.

THE THIRD OF JUNE being the day appointed for commemorating the Queen's birthday, there will be no sitting in court in the Royal Courts of Justice on that day. There was a rumour that the day would also be observed as a holiday in the legal offices, but up to Thursday no order to that effect had been issued.

THE LENIENCY of the judges towards the suitor in person, and especially towards female suitors in person, appears to give encouragement for numerous frivolous applications which are as often as not applications for advice. Usually, the judge or judges listen patiently in order to be able to make some reply to the application, and, in spite of themselves, have to give some instructions in the nature of advice, as for instance, "You must apply on a motion day," or "You have come to the wrong court," but when personal or abusive or blasphemous expressions are used by the suitor in reply, patience is exhausted—and then—

THE SMALLNESS of the Guildhall list seems to shew that there is at present no great tendency in commercial litigation to localize itself in the City. For the present sittings twenty-two special and eleven jury cases are set down for trial. Of course the return to the Guildhall was merely an experiment. The defective arrangements of the old sittings there, and of the subsequent sittings at the Royal Courts, had damaged the cause list, and it by no means followed that the mere revival of the trial of actions in the City would bring back the business which had been lost. It may well be that the convenience of having all causes in the High Court heard in the same building outweighs the slight advantage gained by having some heard at the Guildhall; and if in practice this is found to be so, the *raison d'être* of the sittings there will have vanished. It will be time enough, however, to suggest a further change when it is seen what effect the impending alteration of procedure and of circuit arrangements is likely to have upon litigation.

MEANWHILE it would be well for those who have the management of cases to be careful not to lend themselves to such a

breakdown as occurred recently in the second court at the Guildhall. In Mr. Justice KENNEDY's list three cases were down for trial, and none of them proved effective. Owing to the fact of the same counsel being employed in each of the cases in Mr. Baron POLLOCK's list, it was impossible to borrow a case from him, and shortly before twelve the jurymen summoned were dismissed and the judge rose for the day. Of course it is easy to make too much of such an incident, and it may be that in the present instance there were good reasons to account for the breakdown of the list. In any case it is better by having a short list to run the risk of the occasional waste of judicial time than by making it unnecessarily long to waste the time of a host of persons, clients, witnesses, and lawyers. But it is obviously incumbent upon solicitors who have cases waiting for trial to do all they can to assist the officials to draw up such a list as shall fairly provide for the business of the day, and especially to give notice where their cases are settled or are likely to be settled.

LEGISLATION by rules and orders has been frequently referred to as objectionable, but the Judicature Bill, introduced by the Lord Chancellor in the House of Lords, shews, in clause 4, which has reference to officers of the Supreme Court, a further development of this practice. The general effect of that clause enables the Lord Chancellor, with the concurrence of the Treasury in matters affecting public expenditure, to make orders regulating the salaries, numbers, qualifications, duties, and attendance of officers, their holidays, sick leave, the temporary employment of substitutes, their promotion, age of retirement, and removal, and this without regard to Acts of Parliament regulating many of these subject-matters, and without in any way attempting to take into consideration, or to preserve, the rights of those who hold their offices under statutes. In short, the Bill as framed empowers the Lord Chancellor, by a simple stroke of the pen, to repeal Acts of Parliament regardless of the consequences to those who may have served for years relying on the justice of the Legislature. Apart, too, from any question of vested rights, the absence of any provision giving some preference to, and affording some consideration for, all existing officers, whether they have vested rights or not, is a conspicuous blot on this extremely drastic Bill.

WE PUBLISH elsewhere our annual list of attendances of members of the Council of the Incorporated Law Society. As usual, Mr. PENNINGTON is at the head of the list, but with a slight diminution of his last year's extraordinary record. He had 238 attendances last year, while this year he has 224. Mr. GODDEN comes next with 132 attendances, while Mr. JOHN HUNTER has 114. The above attendances of course include both meetings of the council and of committees. Taking attendances at council meetings alone, it will be seen that Mr. PENNINGTON is run very close by Mr. ADDISON, Mr. MILLS, Mr. ROSCOE, Mr. KEEN, Mr. WILLIAMS, Mr. WALTERS, Sir H. W. PARKER, and Sir T. PAINE. It should be borne in mind, however, that the list is not a fair representation of the interest taken in the affairs of the society by some members of the council. Illness, or the necessity for caution in abstention from overwork, may account for a largely diminished number of attendances on the part of members who are among the pillars of the council. In truth, the only correct mode of arriving at the working, as opposed to the ornamental, members is to take an average of three years' attendances. One of the most satisfactory features of the present list is the large increase in the attendances of the extraordinary members. There are this year 83 attendances as against 40 last year.

OUR INQUIRY last week as to the oldest practising country solicitor has elicited several interesting communications, with the usual result of depositing our last week's "favourite." So far the oldest country solicitor we have heard of whose name appears in this year's *Law List* is Mr. E. M. WAVELL, of Halifax, who was admitted in Easter, 1830, and is still actively engaged in practice. He has a year's seniority over Mr. GEORGE WHITE, of Epsom, to whom we referred last week. But among solicitors

whose names do not appear in the *Law List* as having taken out certificates for the present year we have some remarkable instances from Derbyshire and Plymouth. Mr. JOSEPH SALE, of Derby, who was admitted in Easter, 1825, is, we are informed, still living and active, while Mr. JOSEPH HALE, of Castleton, who was admitted in Trinity, 1817, and died about four years ago, practised up to his death. Mr. JOHN BAYLY, of Plymouth, was admitted in Hilary, 1826; and a correspondent who sends us his name says that "in this healthy climate there may be non-practising solicitors admitted somewhere in the first years of the present century." If there are any such veterans, we should be glad to have particulars of them. Up to the present the result of our inquiries has been to place Mr. E. M. WAVELL, of Halifax (Easter, 1830), at the head of the list of country solicitors whose names appear in this year's *Law List* as in actual practice, with Mr. GEORGE WHITE, of Epsom (Easter, 1831), second, and Mr. J. S. ELDRIDGE, of Southampton (Trinity, 1833), third. It will be very remarkable, however, if solicitors who enjoy the benefit of a healthy country life should prove to be beaten in point of longevity by the dwellers in this smoky, foggy, unsavoury, bustling metropolis. Yet, as matters stand at present, there are at least six London solicitors in actual practice whose date of admission is prior to that of Mr. WAVELL. Our country friends must look to their laurels. With regard to London solicitors, Sir H. W. PARKER kindly reminds us that in the list we published last week of London solicitors in practice admitted before 1837 we omitted the name of Mr. JOHN FOSTER ELMSLIE, of No. 11, Queen Victoria-street, who was admitted in Michaelmas, 1833. Supposing (as would seem to be the case, since we have not received any corrections) that we have properly settled Mr. CHARLES BISCHOFF as the "doyen" of the practising London solicitors, and Mr. JOHN DINGWALL as the next in seniority, we should be glad to know next what is the *oldest firm* in the City in the same family. We know an instance of an existing firm in the City in which there have been four generations of the family, the earliest member having been admitted in 1771. Can this be surpassed?

AN INSTANCE of the fierce light that beats upon a judgment is afforded by the remark made by Mr. Justice STIRLING in *Baring v. Abingdon* (1892, 2 Ch., at p. 381), that the granting of a new lease to a stranger, with the assent of the lessee, operates as a surrender of the old lease. The learned judge said nothing about the lessee giving up possession; hence, in *Wallis v. Hands, Newman, Scott, and the District of Bristol Collieries Co.* (41 W. R. 471) his *dictum* was seized on as an expression of opinion that a mere parol assent of a lessee to the granting of a new lease to a stranger operated as a surrender of the old lease. It could hardly have been supposed that Mr. Justice STIRLING intended, by an observation of the kind referred to, to express an opinion contrary to one of the most admirably reasoned judgments of one of the most distinguished judges who ever sat on the English bench—we mean the judgment of PARKE, B., in *Lyon v. Reed* (13 M. & W. 285); approved, moreover, by Lord ST. LEONARDS in *Creagh v. Blood* (3 Jo. & Lat. 133); and in the recent case Mr. Justice CHITTY stated that he had the authority of STIRLING, J., for stating that he did not, in *Baring v. Abingdon*, intend to express any opinion on the point whether a change of possession was necessary. Mr. Justice CHITTY has, in the recent case, most usefully and tersely stated the law on the subject, as being, in the words of POLLOCK, C.B., in *Davison v. Gent* (5 W. R. 229, 1 H. & N. 774), that "where a lessee assents to a lease being granted to another, and gives up his own possession to the new lessee, that is a surrender by operation of law." This proposition, as Mr. Justice CHITTY says, may be stated in either of the following ways—viz.: (1) There is no surrender by operation of law unless the old tenant gives up possession to the new tenant at or about the time of the grant of the new lease to which he assents; or (2) the change of possession is a necessary part of the consent. We venture to think, however, that he is correct in preferring the first as being the more correct form. "The foundation of the doctrine that the acceptance of a new lease by an existing tenant operates as a surrender in law is estoppel by act *in pais*, the law attributing

the force of estoppel to certain acts of notoriety, such as livery of seisin, entry, acceptance of an estate, and the like; and the grant of a new lease to a stranger, with the tenant's assent and change of possession preceding or following the lease, bring such a case within the scope of the same doctrine, which mere oral assent would not do."

IN A CASE which we report elsewhere a divisional court (WILLS and CHARLES, J.J.) have had to consider how far a criminal conviction for an offence morally disgraceful, but not involving dishonesty or misconduct in any professional relation, is a ground for striking a solicitor off the rolls. The question is undoubtedly a difficult one. Of course mere conviction of a criminal offence is not sufficient. Everything turns on the nature of the offence. In *Re A. Solicitor* (33 SOLICITORS' JOURNAL, 492) Lord COLERIDGE, C.J., sitting in the Court of Appeal, said it was obvious that, if it were to be laid down as an absolute rule that in every case of a conviction for felony striking off the rolls must follow as a matter of course, the rule would break down at once. There were, he added, some felonies which were infinitely disgraceful, but there were others which an honourable man might commit without suffering any stain to his honour. He must be punished if he did so, for the law must be vindicated, but he would not be unfit to associate with his fellow-men, or to be trusted with their property or confidence. Very similar language is used by WILLS, J., in the present case. "I quite agree that the mere fact of a man being convicted of a criminal offence, even an offence punishable with imprisonment and hard labour, is not in itself sufficient to justify his being struck off the rolls, or being even suspended from practice, because there may be cases in which, although the law has to be vindicated, there may be nothing when the matter comes to be explained which would seriously detract from the confidence which in all the ordinary relations of life, and in the ordinary business relations which a solicitor must maintain with his clients, ought to be placed in him." Thus each judge appears to think it right to look at the substance of the offence rather than at the legal punishment, and he bases the solicitor's disqualification upon either of two grounds—the offence makes him unfit to move in ordinary society, or it touches his professional reputation. As to the latter point of course there is no doubt, but the principle that conduct merely disgraceful in private life is a ground for striking a solicitor off the rolls suggests cases of difficulty. In the present instance it was objected that it would give the court jurisdiction in the event of revelations in the Divorce Court. WILLS, J., however, did not shrink from this result. "Cases," he said, "might come out, even in an investigation in the Divorce Court, which could shew that a man was wholly unfit to be a member of an honourable profession or to be entrusted with the status of one of the officers of this court." At the same time he drew the distinction that there might in such a case be no criminal offence, and though criminality is not conclusive, yet it at least calls for the investigation of the court, and so renders easy the exercise of the jurisdiction of the court. In the case in question the solicitor had been convicted of knowingly permitting premises belonging to him to be used as a brothel, and, as the court very properly considered this to be conduct of a peculiarly disgraceful kind, they had no hesitation in striking him off the rolls. Here, of course, the offence was that he trafficked in the immorality of others. Some day a more difficult question may arise, such as that hinted at above, when the immorality affects directly the person accused.

The annual dinner of the Hardwicke Society takes place next Monday at the Criterion Restaurant (6.30 p.m.). Lord Halsbury will be the guest of the evening.

An echo from the recent festivities at the Middle Temple, says the *Post* *Mall Gazette*, still lingers. On the night when the Prince of Wales dined with his fellow Benchers, a distinguished Scotch judge and wit found himself by the side of a legal peer, who shall be nameless. The latter remarked that he envied the former the famous Advocates' Library at Edinburgh (one of the best, if not the best law library in the kingdom), adding, "We have no books in the House of Lords." "That accounts for some of your decisions," was the prompt reply.

THE SUPREME COURT OF JUDICATURE BILL.

The Lord Chancellor's Supreme Court of Judicature Bill deals with two of the matters which were considered and reported on by the Council of Judges, the limitation of interlocutory appeals and the mode of taking evidence upon applications relating to the distribution of property.

As to the limitation of interlocutory appeals it is natural to compare the present proposals with those which were made by the judges. In the report of the Council of Judges statistics were given of the actual number of appeals from chambers. In the year 1891, it was said, there were in London 39,775 summonses before the masters, of which 3,255 were taken to the judge in chambers, 506 to the divisional courts, and 51 thence to the Court of Appeal. Of the 51 cases so brought before the Court of Appeal not more than 15 or 20 related to mere matters of practice or procedure, and no case of that kind was taken to the House of Lords. But although the number of cases in which appeals in matters of practice had been carried to several successive courts did not appear to be large, the council recommended that the opportunity of using so many stages of appeal should be taken away. Their proposals to this effect, and also with regard to interlocutory appeals generally and appeals from any inferior court or person to the High Court, were contained in resolutions 79, 80, and 81.

To take these in the order in which the respective subjects are dealt with in the Lord Chancellor's Bill, resolution 80 provided that, except in certain specified cases, there should be no appeal from any interlocutory order made by a judge in chambers or in court without leave of the judge. The excepted cases were:—(a) where the liberty of the subject or the custody of infants is concerned; (b) applications under order 14, where a judge has refused unconditional leave to defend; (c) setting aside writs for service out of the jurisdiction; (d) prohibition; (e) injunctions and receiverships before judgment; (f) charging orders; and (g) commissions. In the report it was also said that there should be no appeal at all where unconditional leave to defend had been given. As to these proposals the Bar Committee in their report of December, 1892, emphatically objected to any rule by which the leave of a judge of first instance was made necessary for an appeal, though, if such leave was required, they considered that the Court of Appeal should have power to give leave if refused by the court below. Moreover, the committee suggested that if the necessity of obtaining leave was imposed, the proper course was to state the cases in which the leave must be obtained rather than those in which it was not to be required; but no mention was made of any case of such importance as to require absolute freedom of appeal which was not included in the judges' list of exceptions. The Council of the Incorporated Law Society, on the other hand, went further than the Council of Judges. They recommended in their report that there should be an appeal from all orders of a master to a judge, but that there should be no further appeal without the leave of the judge, except in cases under order 14, where leave to defend has been refused, and in applications for a commission to examine witnesses abroad.

The Lord Chancellor's Bill follows the resolutions of the Council of Judges, but is somewhat more drastic. In two cases there will be no appeal at all—namely, where an order has been made allowing an extension of time for appealing from a judgment or order, and where an order has been made giving unconditional leave to defend. In other cases of interlocutory orders or judgments made or given by a judge, there will be no appeal except with the leave of the judge or of a judge of the Court of Appeal, except when the liberty of the subject or the custody of infants is concerned, and except in cases of granting or refusing an injunction or appointing a receiver. The principle thus adopted appears to be the true one—namely, to prohibit appeals in interlocutory matters without leave first obtained, save in specified cases of recognized importance; but as to the list of such cases opinions may differ. Those contained in the Bill are amongst the cases suggested by the Council of Judges, but others suggested by them, namely, cases under order 14, service of writ out of the jurisdiction, prohibition, charging orders, and commissions, are omitted. Doubtless it is advisable to make the

list as short as possible, but we imagine that it would be well to include, as suggested by the Council of the Incorporated Law Society, cases where leave to defend under order 14 has been refused. It will be noticed that the leave to appeal, where this is required, may be given either by the judge or by a judge of the Court of Appeal. It is not stated whether this is to be in the alternative, or whether the party desiring leave to appeal, after being refused by the judge, can then have recourse to a member of the Court of Appeal. But in any event he will have the chance of submitting the matter to the higher authority, and this is a further reason for restricting as much as possible the list of cases in which an appeal will lie without leave. An application for leave to appeal is to be made *ex parte* or otherwise, as may be prescribed by rules of court.

As to appeals in matters of practice and procedure, the Council of Judges proposed (resolution 79) that there should be only one appeal from orders made by a judge in chambers or in court, and that in the Chancery Division this should be to the Court of Appeal as at present. In the Queen's Bench Division there was to be a court specially constituted for the purpose, consisting of not less than three judges. This suggestion has not been adopted in the Bill, and it is provided that every appeal from a judge in matters of practice and procedure shall be to the Court of Appeal, whose decision shall be final.

The remaining matter dealt with in this connection by the Council of Judges related to appeals to the High Court, and it was suggested (resolution 81) that there should be no appeal from any divisional court without the leave of that court from any judgment or order made by the court when sitting on appeal from any court or person—*e.g.*, from a county court, revising barrister, official referee, taxing master, &c. This proposal completes the restriction on appeals from inferior courts contained in section 45 of the Judicature Act, 1873, and section 20 of the Appellate Jurisdiction Act, 1876, and is adopted in the present Bill with the modification that leave to appeal may be given either by the Divisional Court which has heard the appeal from the inferior court or by the Court of Appeal, and with the further provision that where leave to appeal is given the decision of the Court of Appeal is to be final. Thus the House of Lords will only be able to entertain English appeals in matters which have originated in the High Court.

The Bill, it will be observed, expressly recognizes the existing practice of appeals to divisional courts, although procedure appeals are to be taken direct to the Court of Appeal. "In all cases," it provides, "where there is a right of appeal to the High Court from any court or person, the appeal shall be heard and determined by a divisional court constituted as may be prescribed by rules of court." It would have been preferable had the appeal here also been made direct to the Court of Appeal. This would have saved one possibility of appeal, and would have been practically equivalent, with the proposed change in appeals in matters of practice and procedure, to the abolition of divisional courts. At the same time, as suggested by Mr. Justice CAVE, and approved by the Bar Committee in their report, a third division of the Court of Appeal would have to be formed. In this case the additional judges would assist the Queen's Bench Division either on circuit or in London.

The Council of the Incorporated Law Society also proposed that appeals generally should be regulated according to the value of the subject-matter in dispute. Where this can be estimated in money, and the amount does not exceed £100, it was proposed that there should be no appeal from any judgment or order, whether final or interlocutory, without the leave of the judge, excepting in test cases and in cases under order 14 where leave to defend has been refused. Where the amount is between £100 and £1,000 there would be an appeal, either with the leave of the judge, or on a certificate of counsel, in the latter case security for costs being given or £20 brought into court. In cases above £1,000 the right of appeal would be unrestricted, and so, too, where the matter in dispute could not be estimated in money. These proposals, however, find no place in the present Bill.

All the above matters are dealt with in clause 1 of the Bill. Clause 3 declares that the power to make rules conferred by the Judicature Acts, 1873 to 1891, includes power to make rules for regulating the mode in which evidence of particular facts may

be given on applications relating to the distribution of any fund or property, whether in court or not, and on applications upon summons for directions. Resolution 47 of the Judges' Resolutions proposed, as to the distribution of a fund or property, that the judge in person should be at liberty, in order to avoid expense and delay, to accept or allow testimony of information and belief, and such other evidence as, regard being had to the circumstances of the particular case, he should consider reasonable. And he was to exercise this discretion, without any formal application, by giving directions to the chief clerk in the particular case as to the evidence to be accepted or allowed. Under the clause in question rules will probably be made to the same effect, though it would be well to have some clearer indication of the evidence which will in general be regarded as sufficient.

The second case provided for by clause 3 deserves notice, as it seems to indicate an intention to introduce a compulsory summons for directions at the commencement of the litigation as proposed by the Council of Judges. On such a summons it would be necessary for the master to be acquainted with the facts of the case, and under the clause rules may apparently be made regulating the mode in which, for the purpose of the summons, such facts would be proved. It may be assumed that the Bill contains all the changes which it is proposed to found upon the report of the Council of Judges, and for which the sanction of the Legislature is necessary. For the changes as a whole we must wait until the draft of the new rules has been issued.

SERVICE UPON FOREIGN FIRMS AND INDIVIDUALS.

In an article published in these columns rather more than two years ago (35 SOLICITORS' JOURNAL, 374) occasion was taken to review some of the decisions on suing and serving foreign firms, and to summarize some of the practical results of those decisions. Two of those results were there stated as follows:—"A purely foreign firm, all the partners in which reside abroad, cannot be sued as a firm. The partners must be sued individually (*Western National Bank of New York v. Perez, Triana, & Co.*, overruling *Pollexfen v. Sibon*)," "A single individual residing abroad and being a foreign subject and carrying on business in this country in the name of a firm must be sued individually in his own name (*Russell v. Cambefort*, overruling *O'Neil v. Clason & Co.*.)"

Two recent cases (*Grant v. Anderson*, 1892, 1 Q. B. 108, and *De Bernales v. New York Herald*, ante, p. 404; reported on appeal *ante*, p. 475) appear to shew that the practice as to suing foreign firms and individuals remains as stated above, and that the new Rules of Court dealing with service upon partners have not had the effect of altering the practice so as to overrule *Russell v. Cambefort* and similar cases. The new code of rules as to actions by and against firms, which came into force upon the 1st of July, 1891, is contained in order 48a. Rule 1 of that order provides that "any two or more persons claiming or being liable as co-partners and carrying on business within the jurisdiction may sue or be sued in the name of the respective firms, if any, of which such persons were co-partners at the time of the accruing of the cause of action." Rule 3 provides that "where persons are sued as partners in the name of their firm under rule (1), the writ shall be served either upon any one or more of the partners or at the principal place, within the jurisdiction, of the business of the partnership upon any person having at the time of service the control or management of the partnership business there; and, subject to these rules, such service shall be deemed good service upon the firm so sued, whether any of the members thereof are out of the jurisdiction or not, and no leave to issue a writ against them shall be necessary." And rule 11 provides that "any person carrying on business within the jurisdiction in a name or style other than his own name may be sued in such name or style as if it were a firm name; and, so far as the nature of the case will permit, all rules relating to proceedings against firms shall apply."

In the first-mentioned of the above recent cases, *Grant v. Anderson & Co.*, an action brought against a Scotch firm for breach of a contract entered into in Scotland, the plain-

tiffs served their writ upon an agent of the defendants in London, under ord. 48a, r. 3, and the main question was whether the defendants were carrying on business within the jurisdiction. It was held by the Court of Appeal, affirming a divisional court, that they were not, and that the service of the writ must be set aside. But the Divisional Court went further, and expressed the opinion that ord. 48a, rr. 1, 3, have no application to actions against foreign firms the members of which are domiciled and resident out of the jurisdiction; Lord COLE RIDGE, C.J., saying that it must have been intended in these rules "to accept the decision in *Russell v. Cambefort*, a decision which rested upon certain broad principles of international comity"; and WRIGHT, J., stating that that case rightly decided "that a mere rule of special procedure dealing with the technical difficulties relating to the service of partners ought not to be held to enlarge the jurisdiction of the courts." The Court of Appeal decided the case merely on the ground that the defendants were not carrying on business within the jurisdiction, and both Lord ESHER, M.R., and KAY, L.J., who heard the appeal, expressly guarded themselves from deciding "whether the decision in *Russell v. Cambefort* still applies under the new rules," and "whether the case of a foreign firm is within the rule."

In *De Bernales v. New York Herald*, to the singular history of which we have previously referred (*ante*, p. 418), the action was brought against the proprietor of a newspaper who was carrying on business—or, at least, maintaining an office—in England, but was himself an American subject resident in Paris, and he was sued in the name under which the newspaper was conducted—the *New York Herald*. The plaintiff, relying upon ord. 48a, rr. 11, 3, attempted to serve his writ at the London office of the newspaper upon some person having the control or management of the business, and failing in this attempt, came to the court for leave for substituted service by means of a registered letter sent to the office. This was allowed by the master, but his decision was reversed by KENNEDY, J., whose view was upheld by a Divisional Court. LOPEZ, L.J. (sitting in the Divisional Court), referred to the argument of the plaintiff's counsel as to the relation of rule 11 of order 48a to foreigners residing abroad, said, "I cannot think that the authors of this rule intended that service might be effected on an individual foreigner permanently residing abroad simply because he carried on business in this country under an assumed name, where it could not have been effected upon him if he carried on business here in his own name." The Lord Chief Justice concurred, and decided not to read a judgment which he had prepared and in which he dealt with the questions raised by *Russell v. Cambefort* and *Grant v. Anderson*.

So far the question as to the applicability of the rules of order 48a to foreign firms and individuals had not been touched by the Court of Appeal. In *Grant v. Anderson*, as we have seen, the decision in that court turned upon mere matter of evidence; and in *De Bernales v. The New York Herald* the Lords Justices took the sound common-sense view that "a plaintiff could not sue the thing sold as the person selling it," which was what the plaintiff in that case was attempting to do, by suing the proprietor of a journal in the name of his journal. They expressed no opinion upon the reasons for the judgment of the Divisional Court. That judgment, however, combined with the *dicta* in *Grant v. Anderson*, is a strong authority for the view that order 48a has not extended the right of suing and serving foreigners, whether firms or individuals, and that persons who have a cause of action against a foreigner resident abroad which they wish to prosecute before the courts of this country must have recourse to order 11, which deals with service out of the jurisdiction, and must shew that their case comes under one of the heads which are there enumerated. And this view has now been taken by the Court of Appeal in the case of *St. Gobain Channy and Cirey Co. v. Huyermann's Agency* decided on Wednesday. The defendant was a foreigner resident abroad, and carrying on business in this country by an agent. It was accordingly sought to sue him under ord. 48a, r. 11, in the name under which his business was carried on. But the Court of Appeal held, in accordance with the opinion of the Divisional Court in the above cases, and on the principle of *Russell v.*

Cambefort, that rule 11 does not apply so as to allow of a writ against a foreigner in such a case.

It would no doubt be for the advantage of English traders that facilities should be given to them for suing foreign firms and individuals with whom they have contracted; but if an alteration is to be made in this respect it must be made expressly and not left to be implied from rules which *prima facie* apply only to methods of suing English firms. To allow the device which was attempted in *De Bernales v. The New York Herald* to succeed would be to give a larger power of suing a foreigner who trades here under an assumed or trade name than exists with regard to a foreigner who carries on business in his own name—in fact, to allow a technical rule of procedure to enlarge the jurisdiction of the court, a result which, as WRIGHT, J., pointed out in *Grant v. Anderson*, cannot have been the intention of the framers of the rules.

LEGISLATION IN PROGRESS.

SUPREME COURT OF JUDICATURE—The Supreme Court of Judicature Bill, which has been introduced by the Lord Chancellor and read a first time, is a short bill of six clauses. Clause 1, which is designed to carry out some of the recommendations of the Council of Judges as to appeals, and upon which we comment elsewhere, is in the following terms:—(1.) No appeal shall lie—(a) from an order allowing an extension of time for appealing from a judgment or order; nor except with the leave of the judge, or of a judge of the Court of Appeal (b) from any interlocutory order or judgment made or given by a judge, except where the liberty of the subject or the custody of infants is concerned, and except in cases of granting or refusing an injunction or appointing a receiver. (2.) No appeal shall lie from an order of a judge giving unconditional leave to defend an action. (3.) In matters of practice and procedure every appeal from a judge shall be to the Court of Appeal, whose decision shall be final. (4.) In all cases where there is a right of appeal to the High Court from any court or person, the appeal shall be heard and determined by a divisional court, constituted as may be prescribed by rules of court; and the determination thereof by the Divisional Court shall be final, unless leave to appeal is given by that court or by the Court of Appeal, in which case the determination by the Court of Appeal shall be final. (5.) An application for leave to appeal may be made *ex parte* or otherwise, as may be prescribed by rules of court. (6.) This section shall have effect notwithstanding anything in section 19 of the Supreme Court of Judicature Act, 1873, or any other enactment relating to appeals contained. The object of clause 2 is to improve the procedure on appeals from quarter sessions, and to give the High Court on such appeals the same powers as it has on appeals from county courts. It provides (1) that every case stated by a court of quarter sessions on an order or summary conviction for the consideration of the High Court shall be deemed to be an appeal, and shall be heard and determined accordingly; (2) that on the hearing of an appeal from quarter sessions, the appellate court may draw any inference of fact which might have been drawn at quarter sessions, or may give or make any judgment or order which might have been there given or made, or may remit the order or conviction, and the case stated on it, with the opinion or direction of the appellate court, for rehearing and determination at quarter sessions, or may remit the case for re-statement; (3) the appellate court is to have full power over costs both in the appellate court and at quarter sessions. Clause 3 declares that the power to make rules conferred by the Judicature Acts shall include power to make rules as to giving evidence in certain cases. Upon this we comment elsewhere. Clause 4 (on which we comment elsewhere) deals with a different matter entirely, and confers upon the Lord Chancellor power to regulate the conditions of service, and, with the concurrence of the Treasury, the salaries of all officers of the Supreme Court. The memorandum prefixed to the Bill states that the necessity for this clause arises out of the fact that doubts have recently been raised whether Orders in Council regulating the civil service apply to the legal departments. The organizations, qualifications, duties, and requirements in those departments, it is said, are so materially different from those in the ordinary branches of the civil service that great confusion would follow any such application; but, at the same time, there are recommendations in the recent report of the Royal Commission on Civil Establishments which ought not to be disregarded in the legal departments if they are thought right to be enforced in other public offices. Hence the officers of the Supreme Court are to be subject to the Lord Chancellor's regulations, as just stated, and orders based on similar principles to those recently laid down for the civil service are intended to be issued as soon as the power to make such orders is given. The words of the clause specify the following as the matters with which

these regulations will deal:—(a) the salaries, numbers, qualifications, duties, and attendance of the officers of the Supreme Court; (b) their holidays, sick leave, and the temporary employment of substitutes; and (c) their promotion, age for retirement, and removal; but the concurrence of the Treasury is to be required for anything in such regulations affecting public expenditure. Orders made under the clause are to be laid before both Houses of Parliament, and are to apply to any officer of the Supreme Court, whether appointed before or after the passing of the Bill. Where, however, they prejudices existing interests, a remedy is proposed to be given by sub-clause (4), which provides as follows:—"If any person feels himself aggrieved by reason of any order under this section, he may present a petition to the Lord Chancellor stating the circumstances of the case, and asking for the compensation to which the petitioner deems himself entitled, and if the Lord Chancellor thinks the petitioner entitled to compensation, he shall transmit the petition to the Treasury, stating the grounds on which he thinks the petitioner is so entitled, and the Treasury shall have discretion to award such compensation, if any, as in their opinion is just and reasonable." Clause 5 provides for the abolition of the office of Queen's Remembrancer as from the next vacancy in that office, the duties of the office being thenceforth discharged by the senior master in the Queen's Bench Division. The clause, so the memorandum states, is introduced pursuant to undertakings frequently given in the House of Commons when the estimates have been under discussion; although, in fact, the office of Queen's Remembrancer has for a considerable number of years been virtually abolished by consolidation with that of senior master of the Supreme Court.

THE COUNCIL OF THE INCORPORATED LAW SOCIETY.

ATTENDANCE of members of the Council of the Incorporated Law Society from 22nd of April, 1892, to 14th of April, 1893.

	Council.	Com-	Council.	Com-
	mittee.	mittee.	mittee.	mittee.
Mr. Addison	35	43	Mr. Morrell...	22
„ Bristow	24	24	„ Munton	21
„ Broomhead Col-			Sir T. Paine	28
ton-Fox	8	—	„ H. W. Parker	29
„ Budd	15	31	„ Mr. Pemberton	24
„ Cooper	7	3	„ Pennington	37
„ Cunliffe	22	53	„ Rawle	17
„ Deen	—	—	„ Sir A. K. Rollit, M.P.	16
„ Ellett	13	6	„ Mr. Roscoe	33
„ Fladgate	17	13	„ Saunders	13
„ Follett, C.B.	11	4	„ Walters	30
The Right Hon. H.			„ Williams	32
H. Fowler, M.P...	1	—	„ Wing	16
„ Mr. Frere	10	3	„ Blandy	12
Dr. Freshfield	—	—	„ Cooke	3
Mr. Godden	32	100	„ Foyster	2
„ Gray Hill	13	4	„ Green	11
„ Hollams	24	12	„ Humfrys	7
„ Howlett	23	9	„ Lewis	10
„ Hunter	31	83	„ Osborne	7
„ Janson	11	7	„ Venning	5
„ Keen	33	42	„ Warr	1
„ Lake	26	5	„ Woodhouse	10
„ Laurence	11	3	Mr. Barrett	—
„ Manisty	18	23	„ Hughes	2
„ Margetts	14	5	„ Bremridge	2
„ Markby	23	24	„ Cobbett	1
„ Marshall	4	2	„ Wansey	1
„ Mills	35	42	Retired in October.	

* Died 25th January, 1893.

REVIEWS.

CONSTITUTIONAL LAW.

INTRODUCTION TO THE STUDY OF THE CONSTITUTION. By A. V. DICEY, Q.C., B.C.L., Vinerian Professor of English Law, Oxford. FOURTH EDITION. Macmillan & Co.

The first edition of this work was published in 1885, its object being, as the author then said, not to present a summary, much less a complete account of constitutional law, but to deal only with two or three guiding principles which pervade the modern constitution of England, and so to form an introduction to the study of the law of the constitution. Probably it is this restriction of the scope of the work which has given it its popularity and has led to the appearance of a fourth edition within so short a time. A formal treatise on

the details of constitutional law appeals to comparatively few. A treatise on the principles which underlie the constitution, when those principles are expounded with such practical sagacity and wealth of illustration as Professor Dicey brings to the task, is assured of a larger circle of readers and a greater sphere of usefulness. The recognition of the real principles of the English constitution is, of course, a matter of comparatively recent origin, and this is carried out here with greater thoroughness than has before been attempted. The work occupies a foremost place, too, in respect of its continual comparison of our own constitution with the constitutions of other countries. These remarks apply especially to the first part of the book, which deals with the sovereignty of Parliament, and which, we hope, now replaces for the student the theorizing of Austin on the nature of sovereignty. The only change in the present edition seems to be the introduction into the appendix of Note III. on the distinction between a "Parliamentary executive" and a "non-Parliamentary executive." The distinction, as Professor Dicey says, affords a new principle for the classification of constitutions, and brings into light new points of affinity and difference. Thus, if the character of politics be tested by the nature of their executives, the constitutions of England, of Belgium, of Italy, and of the French Republic all belong to the same class, for under each there exists a Parliamentary executive: that is, an executive which is appointed by, and is dependent upon, the legislative body. On the other hand, the United States and the German Empire have at least one feature in common in that they each possess a non-parliamentary executive. The practical consequences of this difference in the position of the executive is worked out in considerable detail, and the whole note is well worth perusal.

THE LAW OF COPYRIGHT.

THE LAW OF COPYRIGHT IN WORKS OF LITERATURE AND ART, INCLUDING THAT OF THE DRAMA, MUSIC, ENGRAVING, SCULPTURE, PAINTING, PHOTOGRAPHY, AND DESIGNS. TOGETHER WITH INTERNATIONAL AND FOREIGN COPYRIGHT, WITH THE STATUTES RELATING THERETO, AND REFERENCES TO THE ENGLISH AND AMERICAN DECISIONS. By WALTER ARTHUR COPINGER, Barrister-at-Law, Professor of Law in the Victoria University. THIRD EDITION. Stevens & Haynes.

This work has considerably increased in size since the publication of the last edition in 1881, and this is readily accounted for by the quantity of new matter which has accumulated in the interval. At the same time, we imagine that the author might have done something to save the reader this additional burden had he chosen to sacrifice unnecessary details and lengthy quotations. An example of a case stated at what seems to be in ordinary length will be found at page 11, where *Prince Albert v. Strange* occupied some six pages, and of a quotation that might well be spared at page 931, where Hansard has been laid under contribution to enable the reader to know, on Mr. Serjeant Talfourd's authority, what reward is justly due to an author. These things are doubtless very interesting and in their way useful, but they are just the excrescences which the author of a legal work may be expected to pare off as he finds the bulk of his book steadily increasing owing to the addition of matters of more practical importance. Still, this is primarily a question for the author, and the reader, if he gets somewhat more than he wants, may be contented that the law is stated in such a manner as to suit his requirements. The new matter in the present edition includes, besides the recent cases, the Patents, Designs, and Trade-Marks Act, 1883, so far as it relates to designs, the Berne Convention, and the American Copyright Act of 1891, of which items the last two have greatly increased the importance of international copyright. Accordingly this subject, and that of copyright in foreign countries, which were made a feature of the last edition, are now very fully treated, and details are given of the law in a number of additional countries. We are the more ready, indeed, to forgive the tendency to prolixity which the author displays in some parts of his work, since it appears to be but a symptom of the thoroughness which pervades the work as a whole, and makes it a complete and reliable guide to the whole law of copyright.

COPYHOLDS.

A TREATISE ON THE LAW OF COPYHOLDS AND CUSTOMARY TENURES OF LAND. WITH AN APPENDIX CONTAINING THE COPYHOLDS ACTS OF 1852, 1858, 1887; THE PRINCIPAL FORMS USED BY THE BOARD OF AGRICULTURE, PRECEDENTS OF ASSURANCES; AND FORMS. SECOND EDITION, Revised and Enlarged. By CHARLES I. ELTON, Q.C., and HERBERT J. H. MACKAY, Barrister-at-Law, LL.B. Wildy & Sons.

In the present edition of a work the value and accuracy of the former edition of which we have tested by several years use in practice, there have necessarily, owing to the forty or more statutes passed since 1874 affecting copyholds, been considerable altera-

tions; and, apart from this, there has been a good deal of rearrangement of matter. One naturally turned to the exposition of the effect of the repeal of section 30 of the Conveyancing Act, 1881, by section 45 of the Copyhold Act, 1887; but as to this we were disappointed to find nothing more than a bare statement of the effect of the sections, with a reference in the footnotes to *Re Hughes* (W. N., 1884, p. 53) and *Re Mills' Trusts* (37 Ch. D. 312, 40 Ch. D. 14). We should have been glad to have had the authors' view as to the question put by Lindley, L.J., in the last-named case (p. 18): "Does the 30th section of the Act of 1881 apply to copyholds at all? There are no words providing for a fine?" The effect of the Settled Land Acts and of the Lunacy Act, 1890, as to copyholds is very clearly stated. The chief alterations, however, are in the chapter relating to enfranchisement, owing to the provisions of the Copyhold Act, 1887, and these are excellently well interwoven with the previous provisions. The decisions which have occurred since the last edition for which we have looked we have found very accurately stated, and we are glad to observe that the table of cases contains references to all the series of reports. The index is very much improved in point of fulness.

BOOKS RECEIVED.

The Secretary's Manual on the Law and Practice of Joint-Stock Companies. With Forms and Precedents. By JAMES FITZPATRICK, Accountant, and V. DE S. FOWKE, Barrister-at-Law. Second Edition. Jordan & Sons.

The Law of Cremation. An Outline of the Law relating to Cremation, Ancient and Modern; together with the Rules and Regulations of various Cremation Societies at Home and Abroad. By AUBREY RICHARDSON, Solicitor. Reeves & Turner.

Bourne's Handy Assurance Manual, 1893. Edited by H. S. CARPENTER. H. S. Carpenter.

Hints on Advocacy, Conduct of Cases Civil and Criminal, Classes of Witnesses, and Suggestions for Cross-Examining Them, &c., &c. By RICHARD HARRIS, Esq., Q.C. Tenth Edition. Stevens & Sons (Limited).

The Liability of Railway Companies for Negligence towards Passengers. By ALBERT PARSONS, Barrister-at-Law. Horace Cox.

NEW ORDERS, &c.

ORDER OF TRANSFER.

ORDER OF COURT.

Monday, the 29th day of May, 1893.

I, Farrer, Baron Herschell, Lord High Chancellor of Great Britain, do hereby transfer the causes mentioned in the schedule hereto from Mr. Justice Stirling and Mr. Justice North respectively, to Mr. Justice Vaughan Williams.

SCHEDULE.

Mr. Justice STIRLING.

William Francis Courthope (plaintiff) v The London Metallurgical Co, Id (defendants) 1893 C No. 1,434
Charles Willis Harrison (plaintiff) v The Balmoral Steamship Co, Id and James Teulon (defendants) 1893 H No. 1,706
The Indian and General Investment Trust, Id (plaintiffs) v Woodhouse and Rawson United, Id (defendants) 1892 J No. 2,071

Mr. Justice NORTH.

John Wood and others (plaintiffs) v Woodhouse and Rawson United, Id (defendants) 1893 W No. 572

HERSCHELL, C.

At the Westminster Police Court, last week, William Moore, stated to be a solicitor, and formerly managing clerk to the late town clerk of Leeds, was charged on remand before Mr. de Rutzen with stealing umbrellas from committee rooms of the House of Commons. There was a further charge against the prisoner of stealing valuable law books from the library of the Incorporated Law Society in Chancery-lane. Mr. C. O. Humphreys, on behalf of the Incorporated Law Society, said there was no doubt that the prisoner was well acquainted with the value of law books. About eighteen or twenty books had been missed from the library, but no suspicion attached to the prisoner, who had been frequently there, until one day when the librarian, whilst taking a walk, saw in a shop window several volumes which he recognised as belonging to the library. Inquiries resulted in the discovery that they had been purchased from the prisoner. A rubber stamp mark on the title-page had been erased. At the prisoner's lodgings some fine glasspaper was found, which Mr. Humphreys suggested had been used to erase the stamp. The prisoner, who denied stealing the books, and said he purchased them from another party, was committed for trial on both charges.

CASES OF THE WEEK.

Court of Appeal.

Re AN ARBITRATION BETWEEN BATER AND ANOTHER AND THE MAYOR, &c., OF BIRKENHEAD—No. 1, 30th May.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT—UNsound MEAT—SEIZURE—REFUSAL OF MAGISTRATE TO CONDEMN—"FULL COMPENSATION"—COSTS OF APPEARING BEFORE MAGISTRATE—PUBLIC HEALTH ACT, 1875 (38 & 39 VICT. c. 55), ss. 116, 117, 308.

Appeal from the judgment of the Queen's Bench Division upon a special case stated under section 7 of the Arbitration Act, 1889 (see *ante*, p. 425). On the 23rd of August, 1892, the inspector of nuisances appointed by the corporation of Birkenhead seized the carcass of a bullock belonging to Messrs. Bater & Williamson, who were cattle importers and meat salesmen at Birkenhead, under section 116 of the Public Health Act, 1875, as unfit for human food. He detained the carcass, and on the 24th of August it was taken before a justice, when Messrs. Bater & Williamson, though not summoned, attended with witnesses, and the justice, after hearing the evidence, refused to condemn the carcass or make any order in respect thereof. Messrs. Bater & Williamson then claimed compensation under section 308 of the Public Health Act, 1875, and arbitrators were appointed under section 179. The question for the court was whether the costs of appearing before the justice and opposing the application for the condemnation of the meat could lawfully be included under the word "compensation" in section 308, so as to entitle the claimants to recover them, in which case the corporation were to pay the sum of £29 18s. 6d. in addition to damages for the detention of the carcass. Section 308 provides that "where any person sustains any damage, by reason of the exercise of any of the powers of this Act, in relation to any matter as to which he is not himself in default, full compensation shall be made to such person by the local authority exercising such powers." The Divisional Court held that the claimants were entitled to recover these costs. The corporation appealed. It was contended on behalf of the corporation that, as the claimants were not summoned before the justice, they appeared voluntarily, and they could not recover their costs, either by order of the justice or upon this arbitration. *White v. Redfern* (5 Q. B. D. 15) and *Way v. Thompson* (33 W. R. 733, 15 Q. B. D. 342) were referred to.

The COURT (Lord Esher, M.R., and Bowen and Kay, L.J.J.) dismissed the appeal.

Lord Esher, M.R., said that section 308 must be read in its ordinary and grammatical sense. It said that where any person sustained any damage by reason of the exercise of any of the powers of the Act, full compensation should be made. What was the ordinary meaning of those phrases? It seemed to him that the words "any damage" must include anything which the person suffered by reason of the exercise of the powers, and then that person was to receive "full compensation" for that damage. It was reasonable and natural for a person, whose property was attacked, to defend it, and to call witnesses to show that he was not in the wrong, and, if that were so, the expense of so doing must be part of the damage he suffered by reason of the exercise of the powers of the Act. These expenses were, therefore, part of the ordinary damage sustained. It was sought to call them costs in the strict sense of the term, and to insist upon that ground that they were not recoverable. They were not costs in the sense of costs which could be taxed. They were expenses in the ordinary sense, and the claimants were entitled to be paid back the expenses to which they had been put by the act of the corporation. They were therefore entitled to this compensation.

BOWEN and KAY, L.J.J., concurred.—COUNSEL, J. Walton, Q.C., and W. F. Taylor; Poland, Q.C., and Maenorran. SOLICITORS, Venn & Co., for A. Gill, Town Clerk, Birkenhead; Hamlin, Grammar, & Hamlin, for R. B. Moore & Son, Birkenhead.

[Reported by W. F. BARRY, Barrister-at-Law.]

High Court—Chancery Division.

BROWNE v. HART—Stirling, J., 30th May.

LITIGATION—COPYRIGHT—INTERIM INJUNCTION.

This action was brought by Mr. Lennox Browns against Mr. Hart, the editor of the *British Medical Journal*, and claimed an injunction to restrain the defendant from falsely stating that certain articles now in course of publication in the *British Medical Journal*, under the title of "Inquiry into the Sanitary Condition of London Theatres" were the result of independent inquiries and original research made by or on behalf of the defendant, or of the said journal, or that such acts were the original composition of any persons employed by or on behalf of the defendant or the said journal, and from publishing without the authority and permission of the plaintiff a certain paper read by the plaintiff on the 12th August, 1891, before the Seventh Section of the International Congress of Hygiene and Demography, under the title of "The Sanitation of Theatres" in its original form, or with such alterations as to make it only colourably different therefrom, and from stating and representing to the public that the plaintiff did not make such careful and detailed examination of the principal London theatres as in the said paper read by him as aforesaid the plaintiff stated he had made, and from appropriating to his own use or for the purposes of the said journal, the plaintiff's said paper, with or

without colourable alterations therein. An article was commenced in the *British Medical Journal* of March 25th, 1893, under the heading of "Inquiry into the Sanitary Condition of London Theatres (by our Special Commissioner)," in which it was stated that hitherto no systematic inspection of theatres had been undertaken to discover what the sanitary conditions really were with a view to having them remedied. A motion was made by the plaintiff for an interim injunction in the terms of the injunction claimed in the action. In his affidavit the plaintiff stated that he had, on 12th August, 1891, read a paper before the Seventh International Congress of Hygiene at Burlington House, on "The Sanitation of Theatres," and that, from April to July, 1891, he had made careful systematic and exhaustive inspections of a number of the principal London and provincial theatres with a view specially to the preparation of the said paper, and he further alleged that the article in the defendant's journal was founded upon his paper, and that portions of it had been substantially taken from the said paper without any acknowledgment or reference thereto, as shewn by the excerpts from the said article and paper, which he submitted in confirmation of his allegation. On the hearing of the motion, the claim, on the ground of copyright in the paper upon which the plaintiff had originally based his right to relief, was abandoned, and it was contended on his behalf that the statement in the article above mentioned was libellous. The defendant, in his affidavit, stated that the article complained of had been written at his request by Dr. Allan, Medical Officer of Health for the Strand District, and he denied that any part of the plaintiff's paper had been used by him or by any other person with his knowledge or authority for the purposes of the said article. Dr. Allan also made an affidavit in which he denied that he had taken any expressions or ideas from the plaintiff's paper, and stated that his article in the *British Medical Journal* was entirely the result of his own personal investigations. Under these circumstances it was contended, on behalf of the defendant, that he was in no way to blame in the matter. He was, however, quite willing to state in the *British Medical Journal* that previously to the article complained of the plaintiff had made a systematic inspection of theatres.

STIRLING, J., said it appeared to him that the case was not one which called for the interference of the court at the present stage. The question was whether the defendant had libelled the plaintiff; but there being no direct reference to the plaintiff in the article complained of, his lordship could not come to the conclusion that a jury would inevitably find that there was a libel. There would be no order on the motion, except that the costs should be costs in the action.—COUNSEL, Hastings, Q.C., and A. & B. Terrell; Buckley, Q.C., and Leverton. SOLICITORS, B. H. Van Tromp; Upton, Atkey & Upton.

[Reported by W. A. G. Woods, Barrister-at-Law.]

High Court—Queen's Bench Division.

APLIN (Appellant); PORRITT AND OTHERS (Respondents)—31st May. CRUELTY TO ANIMALS—RABBIT COURSING—“DOMESTIC ANIMAL”—12 & 13 VICT. c. 92, ss. 2, 29.

This was a special case stated by justices for the county of Northumberland. The respondents were charged under 12 & 13 Vict. c. 92, s. 2, on the information of the appellant, who was an inspector of the Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals, with having unlawfully caused to be cruelly ill-treated, abused, and tortured a number of rabbits. The facts of the case were that on Monday, the 14th of November, 1892, the respondents with a number of other persons assembled in a field and took part in coursing with dogs certain rabbits. The rabbits were wild rabbits which had been caught in nets and confined in boxes, and had come into the possession of the respondents five or six days before the day of the coursing, and had been fed by the respondents while in their possession. On the day when the coursing took place the rabbits were taken one by one out of the boxes and were liberated in the field, and were then chased or coursed by the dogs. None of the rabbits escaped, and after having been bitten and worried by the dogs, were thrown on one side, and in many instances were left in a mutilated and worried condition. The justices held that the respondents did cause the rabbits to be cruelly ill-treated, abused, and tortured, but were of opinion that the rabbits were not domestic animals within the meaning of the Act, and the justices therefore dismissed the information. By section 29 of 12 & 13 Vict. c. 92 the word “animal” shall be taken to mean any horse, mare, gelding, bull, ox, cow, heifer, steer, calf, mule, ass, sheep, lamb, hog, pig, sow, goat, dog, cat, or any other domestic animal, and by section 3 of the amending Act, 17 & 18 Vict. c. 60, the word animal shall mean any domestic animal, whether of the kind or species enumerated in the aforesaid section, or of any other kind or species whatever, and whether quadruped or not. It was contended on behalf of the appellant that the rabbits were at the time of the offence no longer wild animals, but that, having been reclaimed from their original state of freedom and brought under the control of man, they had become domestic animals. Reliance was placed on the case of *Colam v. Pagett*, 12 Q. B. D. 60, in which it was held that linnets caught by a birdcatcher and used by him as decoy birds were domestic animals. The respondent did not appear.

THE COURT (MATTHEW and WRIGHT, J.J.) were of opinion that the decision of the justices was right, that the rabbits were not domestic animals within the Act, and that there was no distinction between their case and that of a bagged fox or caged rats. Appeal dismissed.—COUNSEL, Sneyd, Q.C., and Colam. SOLICITOR, A. Leslie.

[Reported by F. O. Robinson, Barrister-at-Law.]

CASES OF LAST Sittings.

High Court—Chancery Division.

MAXIM NORDENFELDT GUN, &c., CO. (LIM.) v. NORDENFELDT—North, J., 18th May.

PRACTICE—INQUIRY AS TO DAMAGES—PARTICULARS OF DAMAGES CLAIMED.

Under an order of the Court of Appeal of the 19th of November, 1892, an injunction was granted restraining the defendant in this action from carrying on the business of a manufacturer of guns, &c., in breach of his covenant with the plaintiff company, and an inquiry was directed to assess the damages sustained by the plaintiff company by reason of such breach by the defendant. The defendant giving an undertaking as to damages, the injunction was stayed for two months. On summons to proceed with the inquiry, on February 15, 1893, an order was made in chambers that the inquiry should stand over until the plaintiff company had obtained discovery, and on February 24 an order was made that the defendant should make an affidavit of documents relating to the matters in question in the inquiry. On the 24th of April North, J., made an order in chambers that the plaintiff company should within two months give particulars of the damages claimed, and that the defendant's time for putting in his affidavit of documents should be extended to a fortnight after such particulars were delivered. On motion to discharge this order,

NORTH, J., held that the defendant was not entitled to particulars in the strictly technical sense, and that the order must therefore be discharged; but that the plaintiff company must deliver within two months to the defendant a statement in writing of the heads of claim under which they sought damages against the defendant, and that the defendant's time for making his affidavit of documents must be extended to fourteen days thereafter.—COUNSEL, Cozens-Hardy, Q.C., and W. F. Hamilton; E. Beaumont. SOLICITORS, Munns & Longden; Wilson, Bristowes, & Carpmael.

[Reported by C. F. DUNCAN, Barrister-at-Law.]

GOODIER v. EDMUNDSON—Stirling, J., 19th May.

WILL—CONSTRUCTION—TRUST FOR SALE—RULE AGAINST PERPETUITIES—CONVERSION.

This was a summons to decide the question whether the beneficiaries under the will of the testator, Jacob Goodier, took the interests thereby conferred on them as realty or personalty. The testator by his will, dated the 22nd of November, 1837, devised to trustees his real estate upon certain trusts during the lives of his son William, the widow of William, and his daughter Mary; and from and after the death of the longest liver of William, his widow, and Mary upon trust after the decease of such longest liver to sell; and as to the money to arise from such sale and the rents and profits to arise until sale to divide the same between a class consisting (as was held by the Court of Appeal in *Goodier v. Johnson*, 30 W. R. 449, 18 Ch. D. 441) of the children of William and Mary subject to provisions divesting the shares in certain events. It was held that the gift in favour of the children of William and Mary was not void for remoteness. Since that decision the last survivor of the three had died. The real estate had been sold under orders of the court, and the proceeds were about to be divided. In the interval between the death of the testator and that of the last survivor one of the children had died: his real and personal estate went in different directions, and the question arose whether his share in the proceeds of the sale was to be regarded as realty or as personalty.

STIRLING, J., after stating the facts, and considering the observations of Jessel, M.R., in *Goodier v. Johnson*, said that the rule against perpetuities, as was shown by the case of *London and South-Western Railway Co. v. Gomm* (30 W. R. 321, and, on appeal, 620; 20 Ch. D. 562) prohibited the creation of estates or interests (whether legal or equitable) which might arise until after the period defined by the rule. It was rightly admitted in argument that if, in the present case, there had been a power instead of a trust for sale, that power would have been invalid. There was, however, no substantial difference, for the purposes of the rule against perpetuities, between a trust for sale and a power of sale, where the sale was intended to be completed by a conveyance to the purchaser of the legal estate vested in the trustees. A testator or settlor could not, in his lordship's opinion, impose any obligation to sell where he could not lawfully confer a power to do so, or escape from the rule against perpetuities by vesting in his trustees an imperative, instead of a discretionary, power of sale. Therefore his lordship came to the conclusion that the trust for sale was bad. In the present case he should have thought that, even in the absence of the trust of the rents and profits until sale, the beneficiaries ought to be held entitled, but that the beneficial interests would devolve as real estate; for he apprehended that nothing short of an absolute trust for sale could in equity create a conversion of realty into personalty: see *Hyett v. Mekin* (32 W. R. 513, 25 Ch. D. 235). In the present case the trust for sale was void; but there could be no doubt that the interests of the beneficiaries did not fail, and his lordship held that the real, and not the personal, representatives of the deceased child were entitled to his share of the proceeds. He added that the preceding observations were not intended to apply to a case where the trust or power of sale was preceded by limitation of an estate tail. There considerations of a different kind were to be taken into account: see *Heasman v. Peares* (20 W. R. 271, L. R. 7 Ch. 275, at pp. 282, 283).—COUNSEL, Hastings, Q.C., and De Morgan; Buckley, Q.C., and Yardley; B. B. Rogers, Whitaker, and Macnaughton. SOLICITORS, Rowcliffe, Rawle, & Co.; Godden, Son, & Holme.

[Reported by W. S. GODDARD, Barrister-at-Law.]

Solicitors' Cases.

Re R. A. STUART—Q. B. Div., 19th May.

SOLICITOR AND CLIENT—AGREEMENT AS TO CHARGES—REASONABleness—APPLICATION TO SET ASIDE AGREEMENT—POWER OF COURT TO VARY—SOLICITORS ACT, 1870 (33 & 34 VICT. c. 28) ss. 4, 8, 9.

This was an appeal from an order of Mathew, J., in chambers, setting aside an agreement made between a solicitor and his client, Mrs. Cathcart, as to the amount of remuneration which the solicitor was to receive for attending the taxation of a bill of costs on her behalf. The costs had been incurred in proceedings in lunacy by which Mrs. Cathcart's husband sought to have her declared insane. In this he failed, but Mrs. Cathcart had to pay her own costs, and two-thirds of her husband's costs were to come out of a fund in which she was interested. Before the bill had been delivered Mrs. Cathcart insisted on an agreement being made by Mr. Stuart, her solicitor, in these terms:—“*Cuthcart v. Cuthcart*.—Dear Sir,—I agree to pay you 5 per cent. on all costs taxed off Messrs. Crawley & Co.'s bill in the above action. In case there should be no taxation till the appeal to the House of Lords I agree to pay you £10 (ten pounds).—MARY CATHCART. I agree to the above.”—R. A. STUART.” When the bill was delivered it amounted to a sum of about £5,000. The solicitor attended at the taxation, and nearly £2,000 was taxed off. Part of the costs charged in the bill consisted of refresher fees of fifty guineas a day for fourteen days to the husband's counsel: these were taxed down to the maximum for refresher fees allowed by the rules—ten guineas a day. The solicitor claimed his percentage according to the agreement upon the whole amount taxed off. The master, upon an application made to him by the solicitor under section 4 of the Attorneys and Solicitors Act, 1870, held that the agreement was fair and reasonable. Mrs. Cathcart then applied, under section 8, to the judge in chambers, to set aside the agreement, and Mathew, J., made the order appealed from. By section 4 of the Solicitors Act, 1870, a solicitor may make an agreement in writing with his client respecting the amount and manner of payment for his services at the same or at a greater or a less rate as or than the rate at which he would otherwise be entitled to be remunerated; provided that where such agreement is made with respect to business done in an action, the amount payable under it shall not be received until the agreement has been allowed and examined by a taxing officer: if the agreement does not appear to the taxing officer to be fair and reasonable, he may require the opinion of the court to be taken thereon, and the court may either “reduce the amount payable under the agreement, or order the agreement to be cancelled.” Section 8 provides that “every question respecting the validity or effect of any such agreement may be examined and determined, and the agreement may be enforced or set aside without suit or action on motion or petition” of any of the parties thereto, and by section 9 if the terms of the agreement shall not be deemed by the court to be fair and reasonable “the same may be declared void, and the court or judge shall thereupon have power to order such agreement to be given up to be cancelled.” It was argued for Mrs. Cathcart that the agreement was unreasonable, because the costs must necessarily have been largely reduced on taxation without the interference of a solicitor at all, by virtue of the rule which fixed the maximum refresher fee at ten guineas, and that this ought to have been present to the solicitor's mind when the agreement was entered into. The solicitor offered to give up his percentage on the amount taxed off in respect of refresher fees, but he contended that the decision of the master made the matter *res judicata*; that there was nothing unreasonable in the agreement; and that if the court decided against him he was worse off by reason of having obtained the master's approval than if he had not done so.

THE COURT (WILLS AND CHARLES, JJ.) dismissed the appeal.

WILLS, J., thought there were circumstances which made it dangerous to hold that such an agreement was fair and reasonable within the section. He did not think that Mr. Stuart had any other thoughts than those of honesty and honour when he accepted the agreement forced on him by the lady. But she was his client, and he ought to have had it present to his mind and to have informed her that there was a probability, from the eminence of the counsel employed, of very much larger fees being in the bill than could be allowed against her. The only ground of objection against this agreement was the refresher fees. If section 9 had allowed an alteration or reduction to be made, the percentage on the sum from the refreshers might have been taken off. But the section only allowed the enforcement or the annulling of the whole agreement. Therefore, this could not be.

CHARLES, J., agreed, and remarked that the jurisdiction of the court under sections 8 and 9 was quite distinct from that which the court would have if a question were referred to them from the master under section 4. Appeal dismissed.—COUNSEL, *Jeff, Q.C.*, and *Stephen Lynch*; *Bigham, Q.C.*, and *Other. SOLICITORS, R. A. Stuart; Fenton*.

[Reported by T. R. C. DUL, Barrister-at-Law.]

Re A SOLICITOR; Ex parte THE INCORPORATED LAW SOCIETY—Q. B. Div., 18th May.

SOLICITORS—APPLICATION TO STRIKE OFF ROLLS—CONVICTION OF SOLICITOR FOR KNOWINGLY ALLOWING A HOUSE TO BE USED AS A DISORDERLY HOUSE—JURISDICTION OF COURT TO STRIKE OFF ROLLS.

Application on behalf of the Incorporated Law Society to strike a solicitor off the rolls. The solicitor, Mr. George Edward Wear, of Bristol, had been summoned for that he, being the landlord of a certain house, No. 4, Harford-street, Bristol, was a party to its being used as a disorderly house. This charge was heard before the magistrates in the

Police Court, Bristol, and the magistrates, after fully hearing the evidence, held that the charge was proved, being of opinion that the house had been used as a disorderly house many times during the preceding six months, and that Mr. Wear was a wilful party to its continued use as such, and they convicted Mr. Wear and sentenced him to three months imprisonment with hard labour. The conviction was under section 13 of the Criminal Law Amendment Act, 1885, which says that the landlord of any premises who “is wilfully a party to the continued use of such premises or any part thereof as a brothel,” shall be liable to a penalty not exceeding £20, or to imprisonment for any term not exceeding three months, with or without hard labour. On appeal to quarter sessions by Mr. Wear, the conviction was affirmed by the recorder, but the sentence was reduced to a fine of £20. In giving judgment the recorder said:—“This is an appeal from a conviction of George Edward Wear by justices of this city to these quarter sessions, whereby it was adjudged that Wear, being the landlord of certain premises known as 4, Harford-street, was a party to the continued use of such premises as a disorderly house. The conviction is in the words of a part of section 13 of the Criminal Law Amendment Act, 1885. It is necessary for the prosecution in order to sustain this conviction to prove that Wear had knowledge of the premises being used for a disorderly purpose, had power to put an end to the tenancy, and, having such knowledge, was a party to the continuance of such use. It has been proved that the tenancy was a weekly one, and it has been proved that he allowed the tenancy to continue. It was proved that No. 4 was used as a disorderly house during the time in question, and the sole remaining question therefore is whether Wear knew, when he thus allowed the tenancy to continue, that it was so used.” The learned recorder, after going through the evidence, held that Wear knew that the premises were so used, and he affirmed the conviction. An application was now made to strike the solicitor off the rolls.

WILLS, J.—This is a case of very great public importance, as well as of great importance to the person more immediately concerned, but neither my learned brother nor myself entertain any doubt at all what our judgment ought to be. I quite agree with Mr. Coleridge that the mere fact of a man being convicted of a criminal offence, even an offence punishable with imprisonment and hard labour, is not in itself sufficient to justify his being struck off the rolls, or being even suspended from practice, because there may be cases in which, although the law has to be vindicated, there may be nothing when the matter comes to be explained which would seriously detract from the confidence which, in all the ordinary relations of life, and in the ordinary business relations which a solicitor must maintain with his clients, ought to be placed in him. But at the same time when a man has been convicted of a criminal offence, and that matter is brought to the notice of the High Court of Justice, it certainly raises a *prima facie* case which calls for explanation and for a satisfactory explanation on the part of the solicitor; and, to some extent at all events, it throws the *onus* on him of getting rid of what, under the circumstances of each particular case, would be the natural inference that one would draw from such conviction. Therefore a convicted man does not by any means stand in the same position as a man who has not been convicted of an offence. The analogy which Mr. Coleridge put, of a man who had been guilty of disgraceful conduct in the relations of life which brought him within the jurisdiction of the Divorce Court, is, to my mind, a false one. In that case the man has not been convicted of any offence against the criminal law of the country, and the *prima facie* inference to be drawn from that, that there is a case for investigation in this court, does not necessarily arise. Nobody can deal exhaustively with a case of this kind (and I am anxious to say nothing which can limit the proper area of jurisdiction of this court), but there might be cases come out, even in an investigation in the Divorce Court, which would shew that a man was wholly unfit to be a member of an honourable profession, or be entrusted with the status of one of the officers of this court. But, dropping generalities, it is better to come to the circumstances in this case, and I have only made these introductory observations in order to show that I, at all events, entertain no doubt whatever as to our jurisdiction in this matter, and as to its being properly invoked in a case of this kind. Now what is it that this solicitor has been convicted of? He has been convicted of knowingly permitting premises, which belong to him, to be used for the purpose of brothel keeping. *Prima facie* most of us would say that that was a very disgraceful kind of offence, that it was one which not merely involved simply immorality, but that it involved something that it was personally disgraceful in the highest degree to the individual convicted of such an offence. It is said that he was not taking extra rent for these premises because they were used as a brothel. I cannot see that that really affects it, the degree of the profit which he got out of this letting. The learned recorder has found, and found, as it seems to me, upon ample evidence, that the respondent knew at the time when he let the premises to this man that he had kept a brothel, and I agree in the learned recorder's inference from that that he must have known, if he had chosen to think about it at all, that he was very likely to keep a brothel again. He was himself from time to time in the street and going into these houses collecting the rents, and he was a person who had had ample warning, because some years ago he had been proceeded against unsuccessfully for something of the same kind. Therefore he was a person who knew perfectly well what the conditions, if I may so phrase it, of the game which he was playing were, and what were the risks involved, and to suppose for a moment that a man of his class, of his experience, and of his profession, would not know perfectly well what was going on when these scenes are described which took place in his presence in the street, and still more when he went into the house to collect the rents, would be a stretch of charity which would degenerate into absurd and ridiculous weakness. Upon this point let me add this, that the learned recorder has, I think, upon very good ground, disbelieved the statement which this respondent made

upon oath as to what had taken place within his observation, and as to what he knew. Upon that matter he seems to have been contradicted by at least three witnesses. Now, is such a person fit to remain an officer of this court? Is he a person to be entrusted with the delicate, the honourable, and the difficult duties which a solicitor has to discharge, and which he cannot adequately discharge if he is a person of limited education and reputation, and if he is affected with a conviction of, to my mind, a peculiarly disgraceful character, because this trafficking in prostitution, this investing of money in a business of this kind, which is what it practically comes to when a man lets his house to a brothel keeper and knowingly continues him as a tenant when he might turn him out every week, is what most people would feel to be conduct of a peculiarly disgraceful kind, something which the instincts of every gentleman and of every member of an honourable profession ought to revolt against, and in my judgment such a person is not fit to be trusted by this court with the privileges and the status which belong to a solicitor. It seems to me that, granted that this court must interfere at all in such a case as that, there can be no half-way house, there can be no halting place between non-interference and interference in the most complete and effectual sense; and it seems to me that it would be almost an insult to the body of honourable men who are represented by the Incorporated Law Society, to allow a man tainted with such a conviction as this is, under such circumstances as the learned recorder has summarized in his judgment, to remain an officer of this court; and, therefore, I think he ought to be struck off the rolls.

CHARLES, J.—I am of the same opinion, and I do not mean to add anything except that I concur both in the expression by my learned brother of the principles which ought to guide us in exercising this jurisdiction, and also in the view he has taken of the facts in this particular case.

The order of the court was that George Edward Weare, solicitor, of Bristol, be struck off the rolls.—COUNSEL, Hollams; Hon. B. Coleridge, Q.C., and Weatherley. SOLICITORS, E. W. Williamson; Ridsdale & Son, for Gregory & Hirst, Bristol.

[Reported by Sir SHERSTON BAKER, Bart., Barrister-at-Law.]

THE PRACTICAL WORKING OF THE LAND TRANSFER BILL.

The following are extracts from the pamphlet issued by the Council of the Incorporated Law Society to which we referred last week:—

Compulsory registration with a possessory title will be found of little or no present use, because, as has been pointed out, it will not for many years do away with the necessity for an investigation into the earlier title. Consequently, a proprietor who has been registered as proprietor of land with a possessory title will, on attempting to sell, be probably told by an intending purchaser that he must obtain an absolute title, which, in the case of a very large number of titles, will be found either impossible or very costly. As illustrations the following instances (all subsequent to 1889) are given from the practice of one London solicitor:—

(1) LONDON.—*Freehold property, purchased in January, 1893, for £35,000.*—The title, which had been accepted by mortgagees of the vendor, was carefully examined and approved on behalf of the purchaser. He wished to register his title, but, thinking he would gain no advantage by having a possessory title, he applied for an absolute title, and was informed that he had better withdraw his application, as the title of a vendor (a railway company) in 1866 (twenty-seven years previously) was not sufficiently made out.

(2) ESSEX.—*Freehold property which had been for many years in the owner's family.*—As the title had recently been investigated and accepted by mortgagees for about £250,000, no difficulty was anticipated. The abstracts were left in July, 1891, and were returned in July, 1892, with an intimation that the title could not be satisfactorily made out.

(3) KENT.—*Freehold residence.*—The title had been carefully investigated on its purchase by the present owner, and afterwards independently on a mortgage by trustees. After a very great deal of trouble and delay the title was eventually passed as absolute, the time occupied being seven months, and the cost (although the owner was a solicitor and conducted the application himself) about £26 in clearing up difficulties which on the purchase and mortgage had not been deemed worth notice.

(4) DEVONSHIRE.—*Freehold estate.*—The title had been on more than one occasion during the preceding seven years independently examined and approved on behalf both of mortgagees and purchasers. On application for registration with an absolute title no less than fifteen months were occupied, and a cost rather exceeding £100 was incurred for the purpose of disposing of requisitions which had on previous occasions been treated as sufficiently cleared up.

It will be seen from these instances, which could be multiplied, that the statement in the "General Instructions" published by the Land Registry, that—"Where the title appears to the registrar, though not carried back for the full period, to be a good holding title, or where the title appears to him to have been duly investigated in a recent sale or mortgage, the registrar has wide discretion given him which removes many of the difficulties and greatly facilitates registration," is somewhat misleading. Such a discretion may exist, but appears to be seldom, if ever, exercised. Nor is it easy to see how, even in the case of land registered with an absolute title, an investigation into the earlier title can be dispensed with. For the Succession Duty Act (section 42) makes the succession duty a charge on the land, whether in the hands of the successor or of anyone deriving title from him; and this liability, which is expressly kept alive by the Act of

1875, s. 18, sub-section (2), appears to make it unsafe to purchase land without satisfactory evidence (which implies examination into the previous title) that all succession duty, arising in consequence of any death within twelve years previous to the purchase (Customs and Revenue Act, 1889, s. 12), has been discharged. For since the whole duty on a succession attaches to every part of the property comprised in it, it is quite possible that, if the land have been sub-divided and sold in small lots, any one lot may be liable to an amount of succession duty exceeding the gross purchase money! Nothing is in practice more common than for a purchaser on investigating the title to the property which he has contracted to purchase to find that there is some succession which has been overlooked and the duty on which has to be discharged. Either the liability to any such undischarged duty remains on registered land, even if the title to it be absolute, or it does not. If it does, a purchaser must, notwithstanding registration, investigate the earlier title for his own protection, in which case one of the chief benefits of registration will be lost. If it does not, the Treasury will incur considerable loss on unaccounted for successions.

Registration, whether with a possessory or absolute title, is but the beginning of inconveniences, delay, and costs, except in the most simple cases. Take the common case of a landowner who, for some temporary purpose, has occasion to borrow money from his bankers. The Act of 1875 (section 81) tells him that a deposit of his land certificate will be equivalent to a deposit of his title-deeds, and that such a deposit should be protected by a caution (section 49). Obviously such protection is necessary, for a certificate need not be produced on transfers or other dealings, and, if not forthcoming, can be replaced (section 78). So the landowner goes off to his bankers, and it will be useful to give an actual case as an illustration of the result:—A. B., a registered proprietor of freehold land with a possessory title, applied to her bankers in July, 1892, for a temporary advance of £1,500. Had the land not been registered, the loan would have been made on a simple deposit of the deeds without any written memorandum, and without costs of any kind. If the loan, though temporary, might last for six months or a year or more, a written memorandum would probably have been required, and A. B. would have had to pay:

Charges of bank solicitor for examination of title and memorandum of charge under hand			£2 2 0
Stamps	0 15 0
Total			£2 17 0

As, however, the land was on the register, a caution was necessary. The fee for registering such a caution is the same as would have been payable if an actual charge had been made and registered—namely, £5. The caution has to be supported by an affidavit or declaration involving a fee of 1s. 6d., so that A. B. had to pay £7 18s. in all, or nearly three times as much as if she had not been a registered proprietor. In addition, when the loan is paid off, A. B., who, if not a registered proprietor, would have called at the bank and taken away her deeds without any costs or stamps, will, because she is such a proprietor, have to go or send to the Land Registry and to pay a fee of 10s. for withdrawal of the caution. On the 8th of August, 1892, an order was made that no *ad valorem* fee should be charged on the registration of a caution containing a proviso that it should cease to operate at the end of one year or less from the date of its registration, but this does not apply to a renewal, and a minimum fee of £1 is in every case to be paid. This order is of little use. Even if a landowner, wishing to borrow money on a deposit of his certificate, believes that the loan will be temporary only, no banker will accept a transitory caution, and, if he should do so and the loan should extend beyond the twelve months, the full *ad valorem* fee has to be paid in addition to the £1 already disbursed. The General Instructions issued by the Land Registry in 1893 (p. 14)* emphasize this, for, after pointing out that mortgages should be registered, and that cautions are not intended as substitutes for registration, the instructions proceed:—"In order to discourage the practice as far as possible" (that is, the practice of depositing the land certificate by way of equitable mortgage), "it is provided that a caution or restriction to protect a transaction capable of registration shall pay the same fee as the registration of the transaction itself," with an exception in favour of strictly temporary matters, limited to take effect for a year only. Many similar instances could be given, and the importance of the evidence is not only to show the cost and routine involved in all dealings with registered land, but the impossibility of inducing officials to regard the public as anything else but material from which fees are to be extracted, instead of doing their utmost, as private agents are compelled to do, to mould the arrangements of business as to meet as far as possible the requirements of clients. The following is a copy (omitting name and address) of a letter dated the 2nd of May, 1893, written by a manager of a large joint-stock bank on this subject:—"It is a matter of most frequent occurrence, that small freeholders requiring advances come to this bank, bringing the deeds of their properties. I myself look at the deeds, and am generally able, where I know the applicants personally, to satisfy myself that their title will justify me in advancing the sums they require, which are usually taken on current accounts. I then fill up a printed form supplied by head office, which they sign, and that is the only formality. No charge beyond the usual bank charges is made, with the exception of the stamp duty, and when the advance is repaid the deeds are given up, and the document depositing them with us is destroyed. It is only in exceptional cases that I have to consult you, as solicitor to the bank, and then merely as to title, and not as to the instrument; in fact, as a rule, the costs of advances on land by the bank are not greater than those upon note of hand.

* "General Instructions as to registration and transfer of land under the Land Transfer Act, 1875, with the Act, Rules, and Orders, Fees, and a General Index." London: Her Majesty's Stationery Office, 1893.

If it became necessary that these advances, which are often for very short periods, should be secured by documents that would have to be registered, the expenses would probably prevent the transaction altogether, and a provision that loans for a short time need not be registered would not meet the difficulty, because, frequently, these loans, made originally for short time, are extended indefinitely. With a somewhat lengthy experience, I think I may say that the practice I have mentioned is an almost universal one amongst country bankers (joint stock). The routine and difficulties inherent in the system cannot be more clearly pointed out than they are by Mr. Brickdale (the present Assistant Registrar of Titles) in his work already referred to, p. 28:—"The little business that the office has had has been conducted under such perpetual terror of making the slightest mistake or leaving the least loophole for imposition, and, as a consequence, under such stringent safety regulations that the process of first registration costs a great deal more trouble and time than all the law expenses of a sale of the property under the usual conditions, and, what is more, when at length all that trouble has been gone through, and the bill has been paid and the property is registered, the office procedure in registered sales and mortgages and all dealings is so cumbersome as constantly to delay the proceedings beyond the limits of time expended under the old system, and in many cases to result in greater expense to the parties than they would have incurred if the estate had not been registered; most especially is this likely to happen in the case of small properties." Mr. Brickdale is, of course, speaking, in the earlier part of this extract, of registration with an absolute title, but his comments on the cost, delay, and trouble involved in subsequent dealings apply to all registered land. Moreover, in the case of an ordinary mortgage of registered land, two deeds will very frequently be required instead of one as at present. For charges for registration are required to follow a prescribed form, which only allows of the insertion of certain specified conditions as to date and mode of payment of principal, reduction of interest, and the like. If any special clause is needed, it must be embodied in a separate and unregistered deed. Such, for instance, is the usual attornment by a mortgagor who is in occupation of the mortgaged property—the authority to a solicitor who is the mortgagee, or one of several mortgagees, to act as solicitor in reference to the transaction—and the like.

A like difficulty will be found in dealing with building estates, which it is desired to protect by special covenants. The General Instructions state that, generally speaking, only negative or restrictive conditions can be registered, and that conditions involving the expenditure of money, or the doing of any work on the land, cannot be annexed to the title, but must be left to depend on personal agreements between the parties. There are two classes of covenants common on building estates—the one, negative, not to use the land in a certain manner, and the other, positive, to keep up fences and to contribute towards the repairs of roads on the estate. The burden of covenants of neither class runs at law with the land—i.e., a sub-purchaser of the plot is not liable to damages if the covenants are not performed, but he is liable to be restrained by injunction from breach of covenants of the former class, unless he purchased without notice of the covenant, an event which is barely possible, as he cannot avoid notice by neglecting to investigate the title. The performance by sub-purchasers of covenants of the latter class is usually provided for by the insertion of, in the original conveyance, a power of re-entry (restricted as to perpetuity) arising on breach. Covenants of the latter class can be registered under the Act of 1875, but covenants of the latter class cannot be, and must be the subject of separate instrument, and protected by caution or inhibition. In the case of a sale of a small part of settled lands which are affected by family charges, portions, and jointures, it is frequently the practice, in order to save expense, to declare that, as between the sold and the unsold estate, those charges shall be primarily borne by the latter, which shall form an indemnity to the purchaser, who thus saves much expense and complication. On such an indemnity being recently tendered for registration, the registrar declined to register it, as "not being an ordinary charge by way of mortgage, which alone appeared to be capable of registration under the Act." The purchaser, who was a willing buyer, had, therefore, to take a separate and unregistered charge of indemnity protected by a caution with its attendant risks.

Again, by section 34 of the Conveyancing Act, 1881, a declaration by the appointor of new trustees that the land subject to the trust shall vest in the new set of trustees, is made sufficient without any conveyance or assignment; but in the case of land registered under the Act of 1875, the registrar declines to recognize this as sufficient, and requires a separate deed. The additional cost involved in this unnecessary formality can be shewn from a recent experience. The supplemental deed (which was short) cost, including stamps and disbursements, £3 2s. 6d., and, in addition, the preparation and completion of the following further instruments was necessary, none of which would have been required if the land had not been registered:—

- (1) An application to register the death of a deceased trustee.
- (2) A memorial to register the death of the trustee.
- (3) Certificate of the death to accompany.
- (4) Declaration of identity.
- (5) Application to register the conveyance.
- (6) Declaration to prove due execution.

N.B.—The grantors lived in different parts of England.

- (7) Statement of estimated value of land.

The payments were as follows:—

Stamps on the three declarations	£0 7 6
Fee stamps and for new certificates	4 12 0
	£4 19 6

The expense of a plan was saved by detaching the plan from the old certificate, and using it for the new one. But the whole additional cost and trouble was due to the fact that the land had been placed on the register. Some experience may be gained from the colonial system of registration. In a transaction which occurred in the practice of a member of the Council of the Incorporated Law Society, the registration of new trustees of a will as proprietors of a large estate in the colony of New South Wales, made up of numerous purchases, occupied more than a year, and cost a sum exceeding £600. No doubt this was a somewhat exceptional case, but similar examples of delay and cost are stated to be not unfrequent in the Australian colonies.

Another inconvenience is this. The Land Registry will not amalgamate land held under different titles, but gives a separate number to each title, even though included in one certificate, and thus increases the fees. In the present month a registered owner of land with an absolute title wished to ascertain the exact terms in which an incumbrance had been entered on the register, the entry being later than the date of his certificate. He went to the registry, produced the certificate, and asked to see the entry. He was told that he must sign an application, and pay a fee of 5s.; but, on the official looking at his certificate, he said: "Oh, there are three titles here, so the fee will be 15s.!" The owner left his curiosity unsatisfied.

A registered owner who does not carefully complete his title, and register every charge from time to time, experiences very great difficulty and cost in subsequent dealings. The following is an example:—Land in Sussex was in 1891 submitted to a bank as security for an advance. It appeared that the land had been purchased from the trustees of the will of the registered owner for £200, apparently in ignorance or forgetfulness of the fact that it was registered land, and that neither the will nor the conveyance by the trustees had been registered. In order to make up the title a memorial of the death of the registered owner had to be prepared and completed, a memorial of the probate and evidence of the identity of the testator, a statement of title made and lodged, the will and conveyance printed, and the execution by each of the trustees proved. After a great delay, the title was completed; but the actual expenses of doing so amounted to upwards of £20, or about 10 per cent. on the value.

Some transactions, exceptional at any time, would be impossible in the case of registered land. For instance, it was recently (May, 1893) arranged to borrow £9,000 by a sub-mortgage of a family charge of greater amount secured on family estates, which stood limited to such uses as the father (who was the borrower) and the son, who was in New Zealand, should jointly appoint. It turned out on investigation that the family charge did not contain any power of sale, and that, owing to its date, no such power was implied. The intended lender required that the father and son should, by the exercise of their power of appointment, remedy this defect, and create a fresh charge with the usual modern powers. The money was required at once, and the delay involved in correspondence with New Zealand could not be faced. A short deed of appointment was prepared and telegraphed to New Zealand, with instructions that it should be engrossed and executed there, and a telegram sent by a named official that this had been done. The lender agreed to accept this and the contemporaneous execution by the father of a duplicate as sufficient, and so to complete the transaction. Such a transaction would have been impossible if the charge had been on registered land.

It will probably be pointed out that many, if not most, of these difficulties and inconveniences could be removed by rules. This is, no doubt, true, and one would have thought that, while the system was voluntary and depended on itself for its attraction, efforts would have been made by those responsible for its working to render it as economical, speedy, and convenient as possible. But this has not been the case. The Act was passed in 1875, and in the same year rules were issued which are still in force. During fourteen years of almost absolute failure, no attempt was made to improve the system or to attract business. In 1889 additional rules were issued, amending those of 1875, and with them an amended fee order. Instead, however, of reducing the fees and facilitating applications, the fees are in almost every case increased—often doubled, and much more than doubled—and the alterations are so regulated as to press with special hardship upon the smaller class of business. In Appendix A to these observations (p. 42) the two scales of 1875 and 1889 are compared item by item. If now, when the system depends on its own advantages and convenience, the officials so largely increase fees, what are they likely to do when, owing to the system being compulsory, the public are at their mercy? Moreover, the system of registration of title involves very precise and stringent rules and consequent routine and cost. For the title, whether originally absolute or only possessory, is being dealt with as an absolute title to the exclusion of the rights of everyone except the registered owner, subject only, as to land registered with a possessory title, to any claim existing at the date of first registration. How little the officials understand, or, if they understand, study the needs and convenience of the public may be curiously illustrated in another department of the work of the Land Registry. In 1891 the Land Registry took over the business of the Middlesex Registry, and proceeded to prepare rules for the conduct of that business under the altered circumstances. Ever since the institution of the Middlesex Registry in the reign of Queen Anne, the custom has been for the person registering to leave the deed and the memorial for examination by the proper official, and to have the former returned with a memorandum indorsed on it shewing that the registration had been completed. This system works well, and has never given rise to complaints. The registrar, however, desired to alter it, and proposed to issue a rule to the following effect:—"That the person on whose behalf the memorial is left should alone be responsible for its accuracy, the deed to which the memorial relates being stamped only so as to identify it with the registered memorial, and that

the registration should only be effectual if and so far as the memorial correctly represents the deed." The registrar asserted that it was no part of his duty to see that the memorial was correct, and for a long time refused to give way; but on its being pointed out that the effect of his proposed rule would be to convert the Middlesex Registry into a registry of memorials and not of deeds, and that if it were put in force the labour of a search would be enormously increased, he reluctantly abandoned his attempt to revolutionize the practice, an attempt which no one with the slightest practical experience would have dreamed of making. The Middlesex Registry has now been for two years or thereabouts under the management of the Land Registry. By section 127 of the Act of 1875 land in Middlesex, if registered under the Act, is exempt from the jurisdiction of the Middlesex Registry. Landowners and dealers in land in Middlesex have therefore the choice between two registers, the one of deeds and the other of titles, one of which they must adopt. It is instructive to observe that very few indeed select the latter, notwithstanding its asserted advantages.

LAW SOCIETIES.

LAW ASSOCIATION.

The annual general court of this Association was held on Wednesday last: Mr. SYDNEY SMITH in the chair.

The following is the seventy-sixth report of the board of directors:—

1. The directors have the pleasure of submitting a report of their proceedings and the accounts for the past twelve months.

2. The property of the association now consists of the following investments, viz.:—Consols (2½ per cent.), £22,480 11s. 9d.; India 3 per cent., £4,162 18s. 6d.; India 3½ per cent., £465 13s. 2d.; Great Indian Peninsular Railway Stock, £2,500; East Indian Railway Co. (Annuity Class B.) £6,837 10s.

3. The income of the association for the year now ending is as follows:—Dividends on the above investments, £1,195 5s. 4d.; annual subscriptions for the like period, £329 12s.; and life subscriptions, £42, making the total income of the association £1,566 17s. 4d. for the year.

4. The directors have distributed £1,112 10s. amongst 30 members' cases, and £150 amongst 16 non-members' cases, making the total relief granted £1,262 10s.

5. The directors have with deep regret to report the deaths, during the past year, of the following members of the association:—Mr. Charles Dod, Mr. William Groves, Mr. Alfred Carpmael, Mr. Thomas Hoskins, Mr. Edwin Hedger, Mr. Bartle John L. Frere, and Mr. Frederick Iltid Nicholl.

6. The directors have pleasure in stating that the late Mr. Charles Dod by his will bequeathed to the association a legacy of £1,000 payable upon the death of his widow, and Mrs. Dod has been good enough to intimate that she will continue her late husband's annual subscription of £2 2s.

7. By the regulations of the association, the president, vice-president, treasurers, directors, and auditors for the ensuing year are to be elected at the present meeting.

8. The directors feel that having regard to the highly beneficial operation of the association in the past, they may well urge upon the members the desirability of their making further personal efforts to promote its interests.

LAW STUDENTS' JOURNAL.

THE COUNCIL OF LEGAL EDUCATION.

As the result of the examination held at Lincoln's-inn Hall in May, the Council of Legal Education have awarded:—To Henry M. Giveen, Lincoln's-inn, a studentship of 100 guineas a year, tenable for three years; to Robert D. Megaw, Middle Temple, Manmohan Lal Agarwala, Gray's-inn, and Alexander Grant, Inner Temple, certificates of honour; to Robert D. Megaw, Middle Temple, a special prize of £50 for the best examination in constitutional law (English and Colonial) and legal history; and to James Lade, Middle Temple, the Barstow Law Scholarship.

Pass certificates were awarded the following gentlemen:—

Inner Temple.—William P. Addleshaw, Bomonji Ratanji Bomonji, John V. Bradson, James F. Buckley, Thomas Casson, William B. Cowlishaw, Framroaz Muncherji Dadina, Altamont C. Elmore, John St. F. Fair, Charles H. Falcon, Leonard B. Franklin, John Garlick, Park Goff, Frederick W. Grantham, Colley E. G. H. Grattan, Anthony E. Harrison, Henry B. Irving, Cyril Jackson, Henry Jordan, Ernest A. Parkyn, Richard T. Prieleau, Frank L. Puxley, John S. Risley, Robert Russell, Abdula Rahimtulla Sayani, Francis J. T. Sharpe, Leslie Shepherd-Smith, Thomas R. Spyers, Power M. le Poer Trench, Julian W. W. Weigall, and John B. White.

Middle Temple.—Kamalkrishna Shelley Bonnerjee, Cecil M. Browne, Colin H. Browning, Ernest Clark, Arthur Colville, William M. Crowd, John P. G. H. Ellis, John C. F. Finn, Laurence Ginnell, Syed Motahhar Hussain, Cecil J. B. Hurst, Syed Nehal Hussain, Judah Israel, John C. Jordan, James Lade, James M. Lainé, Melville M'C. G. Neill, Sardar Abdul Rahman Khan, Edward P. Schjott, Song Ong Siang, Arjan Singh, and Joseph F. B. Sutherland.

Lincoln's-inn.—William H. Ames, John R. Barker, George H. Foley, Richard H. Hodge, John A. Longley, Henry T. Methold, Philip S. Oswald, Thomas E. Saunt, Robert Steven, and Oscar M. Wihl.

Gray's-inn.—Hakim Aminuddin, John H. Burton, Ernest Profulsaunn Ghosh, Edgar S. London, and Walter Young.

Of 106 candidates examined, 68 passed.

The following gentlemen passed in Roman law:—

Inner Temple.—Albert E. H. Birch, Ernest M. Bonus, Joseph S. Clouston, William S. Duxbury, John J. Fernandes, John H. de P. T. Gosset, Jabez F. Hebron, Rowland N. Hebron, Owen J. Llewellyn, Percy J. Preece, Francis E. N. Rogers, Fleetwood Sandeman, Alexander S. A. Westropp, John F. Wilson, and Henry F. Wright.

Middle Temple.—Syed Sharuddin Ahmad, Syud Mohamed Bilgrami, Satish Ranjan Das, Henry C. Davenport, James H. Gray, Nand Kishore Kacker, Frederick D. Maxwell, Syed Humayon Mirza, Frederick J. W. Sharman, Goonoo Lall Shaw, Thomas S. Smith, Walter M. Thin, and Robert T. Warner.

Lincoln's-inn.—Herbert Broadbent, Reginald V. Le Bas, Eustace S. Paton, Whitmore L. Richards, Nanaji Sidram Sinde, George G. Solomon, Philip D. Tuckett, and George James Turner.

Gray's-inn.—Frederick S. La Chapelle and Cecil Walsh.

Of 48 candidates examined, 38 passed.

LEGAL NEWS.

OBITUARY.

Mr. ARTHUR SHIRLEY EDDIS, Q.C., judge of the County Court Circuit No. 41, died of pneumonia on the 23rd ult., at Stoke Bishop Vicarage, the residence of his brother-in-law, the Rev. David Wright. Mr. Eddis was educated at Trinity College, Cambridge, and was senior Chancellor's Medallist. He was called to the bar in 1845. He obtained silk in 1869. He was Professor of Equity to the Inns of Court from 1875 to 1883, and in the latter year was appointed to the judgeship of the Clerkenwell County Court.

Mr. HENRY W. LORD, one of the four registrars of the chief Probate Registry at Somerset House, died suddenly on Saturday last in his 60th year. Mr. Lord was called to the bar in 1869. He was for some years the head of the Probate Registry in Manchester, and was subsequently promoted to London. Mr. Lord lost his wife recently, and his death was due to an affection of the heart.

Mr. GEORGE WILLIAM MARSDEN, solicitor, died recently, at the age of 81. Mr. Marsden, who was admitted in 1835, was appointed vestry clerk of St. Michael Paternoster Royal and of St. Martin Vintry in that year. He was also vestry clerk of Camberwell for 42 years, and was also clerk to the burial board, to the magistrates, to the assessment committee, to the public baths and wash-houses, and to the library commissioners. On his retirement from the vestry clerkship of Camberwell last year he was entertained at a public dinner.

APPOINTMENTS.

Mr. F. MEADOWS WHITE, Q.C., has been appointed judge of the Clerkenwell County Court, in place of the late Judge Eddis, Q.C. Mr. Meadows White was called to the bar in 1853, and has been a member of the South-Eastern Circuit.

Mr. F. BRINSLEY-HARPER, solicitor, of 15, Old Jewry Chambers, Bank, E.C., has been appointed a Commissioner of Deeds (with power to take and certify affidavits, depositions, and acknowledgments) in the State of Nevada, U.S.A.

Mr. THOMAS WASHINGTON CHAMBERS, solicitor, of Brighouse, in the county of York, has been appointed a Commissioner for Oaths. Mr. T. W. Chambers was admitted in April, 1887.

Mr. GEORGE ALBERT BROMET, solicitor (of the firm of Bromet & Sons), of Leeds and Tadcaster, has been appointed a Commissioner for Oaths. Mr. G. A. Bromet was admitted in November, 1885.

Mr. ERIC RICHARD WARD, solicitor, of Plymouth, has been appointed a Commissioner for Oaths. Mr. E. R. Ward was admitted in January, 1887.

Mr. THOMAS OLIVER EVANS, of 13, Bouvierie-street, E.C., and Upper Tooting, S.W., has been appointed a Commissioner for Oaths. Mr. Evans was admitted in November, 1886.

Mr. ALBERT EDWARD SCORER, solicitor, of 9, New-inn, W.C., and of Richmond, Surrey, has been appointed a Commissioner for Oaths.

Mr. ROBERT EDWARD STEEL, solicitor, Cheltenham, has been appointed a Commissioner for Oaths. Mr. Steel was admitted in July, 1886.

Mr. JOSEPH SYKES, solicitor, 57, Chancery-lane, W.C., has been appointed a Commissioner for Oaths. Mr. Sykes was admitted in December, 1886.

Mr. FRANK TAYLOR, solicitor, Putney, has been appointed a Commissioner for Oaths. Mr. Taylor was admitted in October, 1886.

Mr. ELLIS WM. TALBOT, solicitor, Kidderminster, has been appointed a Commissioner for Oaths. Mr. Talbot was admitted in February, 1887.

Mr. ARTHUR TOOHEY, Jun., solicitor, 18, Orchard-street, Portman-square, W., has been appointed a Commissioner for Oaths. Mr. Toohey was admitted in Easter, 1875.

Mr. JOHN HERBERT TURNER, solicitor, Huddersfield, has been appointed a Commissioner for Oaths. Mr. Turner was admitted in February, 1887.

Mr. JOHN BYRON UMPLEBY, solicitor, New Southgate, has been appointed a Commissioner for Oaths. Mr. Umpley was admitted in May, 1879.

Mr. CHARLES HENRY UNSWORTH, solicitor, Warrington, has been

appointed a Commissioner for Oaths. Mr. Unsworth was admitted in February, 1887.

Mr. JOHN EDWARD WM. WAKEFIELD, M.A., solicitor, Taunton, has been appointed a Commissioner for Oaths. Mr. Wakefield was admitted in June, 1883.

Mr. ARTHUR THOMAS WALLIS, solicitor, Nottingham, has been appointed a Commissioner for Oaths. Mr. Wallis was admitted in December, 1883.

Mr. WALTER HAMMOND FRANCIS, solicitor, Cambridge, has been appointed a Commissioner for Oaths. Mr. Francis was admitted in November, 1882.

Mr. LIONEL GEORGE FISHER, solicitor, Long Melford, has been appointed a Commissioner for Oaths. Mr. Fisher was admitted in November, 1890. He is joint clerk to the justices for the Melford Division.

Mr. WM. BEDFORD GLASIER, solicitor, 47, Essex-street, Strand, has been appointed a Commissioner for New South Wales. Mr. Glasier was admitted in December, 1878. He is commissioner for the Gold Coast Colony, and a commissioner for oaths.

Mr. PERY GEORGE GATES, solicitor, 7, Victoria-street, Westminster, S.W., has been appointed a Commissioner for Oaths. Mr. Gates was admitted in May, 1886.

Mr. WM. JOHN HELLYAR, solicitor, 28, Austin Friars, E.C., has been appointed a Commissioner for Oaths. Mr. Hellyar was admitted in January, 1887.

Mr. EDGAR KEMPSON, solicitor, Farnham, has been appointed a Commissioner for Oaths. Mr. Kempson was admitted in Hilary, 1886. He is clerk to the Crondall School Board and to the managers of the Farnham, Alton, and Hartley Witney District Schools.

Mr. GEORGE EDWARD LOWE, solicitor, Burton-on-Trent, has been appointed a Commissioner for Oaths. Mr. Lowe was admitted in May, 1884.

Mr. ARTHUR STUART MILES, solicitor, Tenbury, has been appointed a Commissioner for Oaths. Mr. Miles was admitted in Trinity, 1874.

Mr. MICHAEL HERBERT POPE, B.A. Camb., solicitor, 25, Great James-street, Bedford-row, has been appointed a Commissioner for Oaths. Mr. Pope was admitted in July, 1883.

Mr. HENRY TAYLOR RUTHERFORD, solicitor, Blyth, has been appointed a Commissioner for Oaths. Mr. Rutherford was admitted in February, 1887.

Mr. JAMES WASON SIMPSON, solicitor, Liverpool, has been appointed a Commissioner for Oaths. Mr. Simpson was admitted in May, 1884. He is commissioner for the County Palatine of Lancashire.

Mr. HENRY SPARSHATT, solicitor, South Norwood, has been appointed a Commissioner for Oaths. Mr. Sparshatt was admitted in April, 1881, after passing the Final Examination with honours.

Mr. JOHN SEFTON, solicitor, Liverpool, has been appointed a Commissioner for Oaths. Mr. Sefton was admitted in March, 1885.

Mr. WILLIAM ATTCHERLY TETLOW, solicitor, Liverpool, has been appointed a Commissioner for Oaths. Mr. Tetlow was admitted in February, 1887.

Mr. ARTHUR JOHN WISE, solicitor, Boscombe, has been appointed a Commissioner for Oaths. Mr. Wise was admitted in May, 1880.

Mr. REGINALD THORNBORO BARNES, solicitor, Liverpool, has been appointed a Commissioner for Oaths. Mr. Barnes was admitted in April, 1886.

Mr. REGINALD STAWELL CROSSE, solicitor, South Molton, has been appointed a Commissioner for Oaths. Mr. Crosse was admitted in March, 1887. He is deputy county court registrar.

Mr. ERNEST RADCLIFFE CRUMP, solicitor, 15, Parliament-street, S.W., has been appointed a Commissioner for Oaths. Mr. Crump was admitted in March, 1882.

Mr. THOMAS OLIVER EVANS, solicitor, 13, Bouverie-street, Fleet-street, E.C., has been appointed a Commissioner for Oaths. Mr. Evans was admitted in November, 1886.

Mr. JOHN IVOR EVANS, solicitor, Swansea, has been appointed a Commissioner for Oaths. Mr. Evans was admitted in February, 1887.

CHANGES IN PARTNERSHIPS.

DISSOLUTION.

FRANCIS RICHARD HALES and ALBAN CHAVASSE, solicitors (Hales & Chavasse), 7, Martin's-lane, Cannon-street, London. May 15.

[*Gazette*, May 26.]

GENERAL.

It is proposed at the ensuing Commencement at Cambridge to confer the degree of Doctor of Law on Lord Herschell.

Lord Coleridge summoned a meeting of the Lord's Justices of Appeal and the Judges of the Queen's Bench Division for Friday afternoon, at 3.30, in his Lordship's private room at the Law Courts, for the purpose of choosing the circuits for the ensuing summer assizes.

The *Daily News* says that if his engagements in connection with the Behring Sea Arbitration permit, Sir Charles Russell intends to make a flying visit to London in order to preside at the Grand Day Dinner at Lincoln's Inn

on Tuesday next. The Attorney-General is Treasurer for the year, and the guest of the evening will be the Duke of York.

In a western justice court, says the *Central Law Journal*, a question arising as to certain powers of receivers, counsel in reading an authority to the court came across the words *sui generis*, which he translated, in all soberness, to the court as meaning that the officer so described had a right to sue generally. The judge accepted the translation as correct, until a smile among the lawyers present raised a doubt in his mind.

The Attorney-General concluded his argument on behalf of Great Britain in the Behring Sea Arbitration at noon on Wednesday, and was immediately followed by Sir Richard Webster. Sir Charles Russell said that to the number of authorities he had already cited he had only one to add—that of a distinguished English writer on international law, Mr. W. E. Hall, to whom all practising lawyers in England and America were indebted for his valuable treatise.

COURT PAPERS.

SUPREME COURT OF JUDICATURE.

Date.	ROTA OF REGISTRARS IN ATTENDANCE ON	
	APPEAL COURT No. 2.	Mr. Justice CHIFFT.
Monday, June 5	Mr. Pemberton	Mr. Jackson
Tuesday 6	Ward	Clowes
Wednesday 7	Pemberton	Jackson
Thursday 8	Ward	Clowes
Friday 9	Pemberton	Jackson
Saturday 10	Ward	Clowes
	Mr. Justice STIRLING.	Mr. Justice KEERWICH.
Monday, June 5	Mr. Farmer	Mr. Carrington
Tuesday 6	Rolt	Lavie
Wednesday 7	Farmer	Carrington
Thursday 8	Rolt	Lavie
Friday 9	Farmer	Carrington
Saturday 10	Rolt	Lavie

TRINITY Sittings, 1893.

APPEAL COURT, I.

Final and interlocutory appeals from the Queen's Bench Division, the Probate, Divorce, and Admiralty Division (Admiralty), and the Queen's Bench Division Sitting in Bankruptcy.

Tues., May 30	App. motns ex pte—orgl mots—apps from orgs made on interlocutory mots and new trial paper
Wed. 31	New trial paper
Thurs., June 1	Bkwy apps and new trial paper
Friday 2	New trial paper
Saturday ... 3	App. motns ex pte—orgl mots—apps from orgs made on interlocutory mots and Q B final appeals if required
Tues. 6	Q B final apps
Wed. 7	Q B final apps
Thursday ... 8	Bkwy apps and Q B final apps
Friday 9	Q B final apps
Saturday ... 10	App. motns ex pte—orgl mots—apps from orgs made on interlocutory mots and new trial paper if required
Monday ... 12	App. motns ex pte—orgl mots—apps from orgs made on interlocutory mots and new trial paper if required
Tuesday ... 13	New trial paper
Wednesday ... 14	Bkwy apps and new trial paper
Thursday ... 15	New trial paper
Friday 16	New trial paper
Saturday ... 17	App. motns ex pte—orgl mots—apps from orgs made on interlocutory mots and new trial paper if required
Monday ... 19	App. motns ex pte—orgl mots—apps from orgs made on interlocutory mots and Q B final appeals if required
Tuesday ... 20	Q B final apps
Wednesday ... 21	Bkwy apps and Q B final apps
Thursday ... 22	Q B final apps
Friday 23	App. motns ex pte—orgl mots—apps from orgs made on interlocutory mots and new trial paper if required
Saturday ... 24	App. motns ex pte—orgl mots—apps from orgs made on interlocutory mots and new trial paper if required
Monday ... 25	App. motns ex pte—orgl mots—apps from orgs made on interlocutory mots and Q B final appeals if required
Tuesday ... 26	New trial paper
Wednesday ... 27	Bkwy apps and new trial paper
Thursday ... 28	New trial paper
Friday 29	App. motns ex pte—orgl mots—apps from orgs made on interlocutory mots and new trial paper if required
Saturday ... 30	App. motns ex pte—orgl mots—apps from orgs made on interlocutory mots and new trial paper if required
Monday ... 31	App. motns ex pte—orgl mots—apps from orgs made on interlocutory mots and Q B final appeals if required
Tuesday ... 1	Q B final apps
Wednesday ... 2	Bkwy apps and Q B final apps
Thursday ... 3	Q B final apps
Friday 4	App. motns ex pte—orgl mots—apps from orgs made on interlocutory mots and new trial paper if required
Saturday ... 5	App. motns ex pte—orgl mots—apps from orgs made on interlocutory mots and new trial paper if required
Monday ... 6	App. motns ex pte—orgl mots—apps from orgs made on interlocutory mots and Q B final appeals if required
Tuesday ... 7	Bkwy apps and Q B final apps
Wednesday ... 8	Q B final apps
Thursday ... 9	App. motns ex pte—orgl mots—apps from orgs made on interlocutory mots and new trial paper if required
Friday 10	App. motns ex pte—orgl mots—apps from orgs made on interlocutory mots and new trial paper if required
Saturday ... 11	App. motns ex pte—orgl mots—apps from orgs made on interlocutory mots and new trial paper if required
Monday ... 12	App. motns ex pte—orgl mots—apps from orgs made on interlocutory mots and new trial paper if required
Tuesday ... 13	App. motns ex pte—orgl mots—apps from orgs made on interlocutory mots and new trial paper if required
Wednesday ... 14	App. motns ex pte—orgl mots—apps from orgs made on interlocutory mots and new trial paper if required
Thursday ... 15	App. motns ex pte—orgl mots—apps from orgs made on interlocutory mots and new trial paper if required
Friday 16	App. motns ex pte—orgl mots—apps from orgs made on interlocutory mots and new trial paper if required
Saturday ... 17	App. motns ex pte—orgl mots—apps from orgs made on interlocutory mots and new trial paper if required
Monday ... 18	App. motns ex pte—orgl mots—apps from orgs made on interlocutory mots and new trial paper if required
Tuesday ... 19	App. motns ex pte—orgl mots—apps from orgs made on interlocutory mots and new trial paper if required
Wednesday ... 20	App. motns ex pte—orgl mots—apps from orgs made on interlocutory mots and new trial paper if required
Thursday ... 21	App. motns ex pte—orgl mots—apps from orgs made on interlocutory mots and new trial paper if required
Friday 22	App. motns ex pte—orgl mots—apps from orgs made on interlocutory mots and new trial paper if required
Saturday ... 23	App. motns ex pte—orgl mots—apps from orgs made on interlocutory mots and new trial paper if required
Monday ... 24	App. motns ex pte—orgl mots—apps from orgs made on interlocutory mots and new trial paper if required
Tuesday ... 25	App. motns ex pte—orgl mots—apps from orgs made on interlocutory mots and new trial paper if required
Wednesday ... 26	App. motns ex pte—orgl mots—apps from orgs made on interlocutory mots and new trial paper if required
Thursday ... 27	App. motns ex pte—orgl mots—apps from orgs made on interlocutory mots and new trial paper if required
Friday 28	App. motns ex pte—orgl mots—apps from orgs made on interlocutory mots and new trial paper if required
Saturday ... 29	App. motns ex pte—orgl mots—apps from orgs made on interlocutory mots and new trial paper if required
Monday ... 30	App. motns ex pte—orgl mots—apps from orgs made on interlocutory mots and new trial paper if required
Tuesday ... 31	App. motns ex pte—orgl mots—apps from orgs made on interlocutory mots and new trial paper if required

N.B.—Admiralty Appeals (with Assessors) will be taken on days to be appointed by the court.

SPECIAL NOTICE.—In consequence of the limited state of the Appeal List the above general arrangement will be subject to modification by the Judges, of which due notice will appear in the Daily Cause List.

APPEAL COURT, II.

Final and interlocutory appeals from the Chancery, and Probate, Divorce, and Admiralty Divisions (Probate and Divorce), and the County Palatine and Admiralty Courts.

Tues., May 30	App. motns ex pte—orgl mots—apps from orgs made on interlocutory mots (sep list) and Chan final apps if required
Wed. 31	Chan final apps
Thurs., June 1	County Palatine apps and Chan final apps
Friday 2	Chan final apps
Saturday ... 3	Chan final apps
Monday ... 5	Chan final apps
Tuesday ... 6	App. motns ex pte—orgl mots—apps from orgs made on interlocutory mots (sep list) and Chan final apps if required
Wednesday ... 7	App. motns ex pte—orgl mots—apps from orgs made on interlocutory mots (sep list) and Chan final apps if required
Thursday ... 8	App. motns ex pte—orgl mots—apps from orgs made on interlocutory mots (sep list) and Chan final apps if required
Friday 9	App. motns ex pte—orgl mots—apps from orgs made on interlocutory mots (sep list) and Chan final apps if required
Saturday ... 10	App. motns ex pte—orgl mots—apps from orgs made on interlocutory mots (sep list) and Chan final apps if required
Monday ... 12	App. motns ex pte—orgl mots—apps from orgs made on interlocutory mots (sep list) and Chan final apps if required
Tuesday ... 13	App. motns ex pte—orgl mots—apps from orgs made on interlocutory mots (sep list) and Chan final apps if required
Wednesday ... 14	App. motns ex pte—orgl mots—apps from orgs made on interlocutory mots (sep list) and Chan final apps if required
Thursday ... 15	App. motns ex pte—orgl mots—apps from orgs made on interlocutory mots (sep list) and Chan final apps if required
Friday 16	App. motns ex pte—orgl mots—apps from orgs made on interlocutory mots (sep list) and Chan final apps if required
Saturday ... 17	App. motns ex pte—orgl mots—apps from orgs made on interlocutory mots (sep list) and Chan final apps if required
Monday ... 19	App. motns ex pte—orgl mots—apps from orgs made on interlocutory mots (sep list) and Chan final apps if required
Tuesday ... 20	App. motns ex pte—orgl mots—apps from orgs made on interlocutory mots (sep list) and Chan final apps if required
Wednesday ... 21	App. motns ex pte—orgl mots—apps from orgs made on interlocutory mots (sep list) and Chan final apps if required
Thursday ... 22	App. motns ex pte—orgl mots—apps from orgs made on interlocutory mots (sep list) and Chan final apps if required
Friday 23	App. motns ex pte—orgl mots—apps from orgs made on interlocutory mots (sep list) and Chan final apps if required
Saturday ... 24	App. motns ex pte—orgl mots—apps from orgs made on interlocutory mots (sep list) and Chan final apps if required
Monday ... 26	App. motns ex pte—orgl mots—apps from orgs made on interlocutory mots (sep list) and Chan final apps if required
Tuesday ... 27	App. motns ex pte—orgl mots—apps from orgs made on interlocutory mots (sep list) and Chan final apps if required
Wednesday ... 28	App. motns ex pte—orgl mots—apps from orgs made on interlocutory mots (sep list) and Chan final apps if required
Thursday ... 29	App. motns ex pte—orgl mots—apps from orgs made on interlocutory mots (sep list) and Chan final apps if required
Friday 30	App. motns ex pte—orgl mots—apps from orgs made on interlocutory mots (sep list) and Chan final apps if required
Sat., July 1	App. motns ex pte—orgl mots—apps from orgs made on interlocutory mots (sep list) and Chan final apps if required
Monday ... 3	App. motns ex pte—orgl mots—apps from orgs made on interlocutory mots (sep list) and Chan final apps if required
Tuesday ... 4	App. motns ex pte—orgl mots—apps from orgs made on interlocutory mots (sep list) and Chan final apps if required

Wednesday 5 App motions ex parte—original
mots—apps from oids made
on interlocutory mots (sep
list) and Chan final apps if
required
Thursday 6 County Palatine apps and
Chan final apps
Friday 7 Chan final apps
Saturday 8 Chan final apps

N.B.—Lunacy Petitions (if any) are taken
in Appeal Court II. on every Monday
at Eleven until further notice.

SPECIAL NOTICE.—In consequence of the
limited state of the Appeal List the
above general arrangement will be sub-
ject to modification by the Judges, of
which due notice will appear in the Daily
Cause List.

HIGH COURT OF JUSTICE.
CHANCERY DIVISION.

CHANCERY COURT, I.

MR. JUSTICE CHITTY.

Tues., May 30. Mots and non wit list
Wednesday 31 Non wit list
Thurs., June 1 Non wit list
Friday 2 Mots and non wit list
Saturday 3 Pets, sht caus, procedure
sums, opposed pets, and
non wit list
Monday 5 Sitting in chambers
Tuesday 6
Wed. 7 Non wit list
Thursday 8 Mots and non wit list
Friday 9 Pets, sht caus, opposed
pets, procedure sums, and
non wit list
Saturday 10 Mots and non wit list
Monday 12 Sitting in chambers
Tuesday 13
Wed. 14
Thursday 15 Wit list
Friday 16
Saturday 17
Monday 19 Sitting in chambers
Tuesday 20
Wednesday 21
Thursday 22 Wit list
Friday 23
Saturday 24
Monday 26 Sitting in chambers
Tuesday 27 Non wit list
Wednesday 28 Mots for Mr Justice North
& non wit list
Thursday 29 Mots and non wit list
Friday 30 Pets (including unopposed
pets for Mr Justice North),
sht caus, procedure sums,
opposed pets, and non wit
list
Monday 31 Sitting in chambers
Tuesday 1 Non wit list
Wednesday 2 Mots for Mr Justice North
& non wit list
Thursday 3 Mots and non wit list
Friday 4 Pets (including unopposed
pets for Mr Justice North),
sht caus, opposed pets,
procedure sums, and non
wit list

Any cause intended to be heard as a short
cause must be so marked in the cause
book at least one clear day before the
same can be put in the paper to be so
heard. Two copies of minutes of the
proposed judgment or order must be left
in court with the judge's clerk one clear
day before the cause is to be put in the
paper.

N.B.—In the weeks when witness actions
are being tried further considerations
will not be taken. They will be taken on
Tuesdays in the weeks when non-witness
actions are being heard.

N.B.—The following Papers on Further
Consideration are required for the use of
the Judge, viz.:—Two Copies of Minutes
of the proposed Judgment or Order, 1
Copy Pleadings, and 1 Copy Chief Clerk's
Certificate, which must be left in Court
with the Judge's Clerk one clear day
before the Further Consideration is ready
to come into the paper.

CHANCERY COURT, II.

MR. JUSTICE NORTH.

Thurs., June 1 Mots and adj sums
Friday 2 Mots and adj sums
Saturday 3 Sht caus, pets, and adj sum
Monday 5 Sitting in chambers
Tuesday 6
Wed. 7 For cons and adj sums
Thursday 8 Mots and adj sums
Friday 9 Mots and adj sums
Saturday 10 Sht caus, pets, and adj sum
Monday 12 Sitting in chambers
Tuesday 13 General paper
Wednesday 14
Thursday 15 Mots for Chitty, J., and
general paper
Friday 16 Mots and adj sums
Saturday 17 Sht caus, pets, and adj sum
(including unopposed pets
for Chitty, J.)

Monday 19 Sitting in chambers
Tuesday 20 General paper
Wednesday 21 Mots for Chitty, J., and
general paper
Friday 23 Mots and adj sums
Saturday 24 Sht caus, pets, and adj sum
(including unopposed pets
for Chitty, J.)
Monday 26 Sitting in chambers
Tuesday 27
Wed. 28
Thursday 29 Wit list
Friday 30
Sat., July 1
Monday 3 Sitting in chambers
Tuesday 4
Wednesday 5
Thursday 6 Wit list
Friday 7
Saturday 8

Any cause intended to be heard as a short
cause must be so marked in the cause
book at least one clear day before the
same can be put in the paper to be so
heard. Two copies of minutes of the
proposed judgment or order must be left
in court with the judge's clerk the day
before the cause is to be put in the paper.

LORE CHANCELLOR'S COURT.

MR. JUSTICE STIRLING.

Tues., May 30 Mots (Stirling, J.), adj sums
and gen pa
Wednesday 31 Mots (Kekewich, J.) and
gen pa
Thurs., June 1 General paper
Friday 2 Mots (Stirling, J.) adj sums
and gen pa
Saturday 3 Sht caus, pets, adj sums
and gen pa (including un-
opposed pets for Keke-
wich, J.)
Monday 5 Sitting in chambers
Tuesday 6 General paper
Wednesday 7 Mots, Kekewich, J.) and
gen pa
Thursday 8 Mots (Stirling, J.), adj sums
and gen pa
Friday 9 Sht caus, pets, adj sums
and gen pa (including un-
opposed pets for Keke-
wich, J.)
Saturday 10 Mots (Stirling, J.) adj sums
and gen pa
Monday 12 Sitting in chambers
Tuesday 13 General paper
Wednesday 14
Thursday 15 Mots, adj sums, and gen pa
Friday 16 Sht caus, pets, adj sums,
and gen pa
Saturday 17 Mots, adj sums, and gen pa
Mon. May 19 Sitting in chambers
Tuesday 20
Wednesday 21 General paper
Thurs. 22
Friday 23 Mots, adj sums, and gen pa
Saturday 24 Sht caus, pets, adj sums,
and gen pa
Monday 26 Sitting in chambers
Tuesday 27
Wednesday 28 General paper
Thursday 29
Friday 30 Mots, adj sums, and gen pa
Sat., July 1 Sht caus, pets, adj sums,
and gen pa
Monday 3 Sitting in chambers
Tuesday 4
Wednesday 5 General paper
Thursday 6
Friday 7 Mots, adj sums, & gen pa
Sht caus, pets, adj sums,
and gen pa
Saturday 8 Sht caus, pets, adj sums,
and gen pa

Any cause intended to be heard as a short
cause must be so marked in the cause
book at least one clear day before the
same can be put in the paper to be so
heard, and the necessary papers, including
minutes of the proposed judgment or
order, must be left with the judge's clerk
one clear day before the cause is to be
put into the paper.

CHANCERY COURT, IV.

MR. JUSTICE KEKEWICH.

From Tuesday, May 30th, until Saturday,
June 10th, both inclusive (but Monday,
June 5th, excepted), Mr Justice Keke-
wich will sit continuously for the trial of
Witness Actions only. In the fortnight
commencing Tuesday, July 11th, and
ending Saturday, July 22nd, during
which Mr Justice Stirling will be sitting
for the trial of Witness Actions, Mr Justice
Kekewich will take motions assigned
to that judge on Thursdays, and un-
opposed petitions assigned to that judge
on Saturdays.

If the state of the Non-Witness List per-
mits the Witness List being taken at
any time after Saturday, June 10th, due
notice will be given.

Subject to the above special announcement
arising out of the arrangement for the
disposal of Witness Actions, the following
will be the Order of Business according
to the days of the week:—

Monday—Sitting in Chambers.

Tuesday, Wednesday, and Thursday—Non-
Witness Actions (including Further Con-
siderations and Points of Law), and
Adjourned Summons.

Friday—Motions and Non-Witness Actions
or Adjourned Summons.

N.B.—Friday, August 11th, will be the
last day for which notice of motion can
be given without special leave.

Saturday—Short Causes, Petitions, and
Non-Witness Actions or Adjourned Sum-
mons.

Liverpool and Manchester Business will be
taken as follows:—

Motions on days appointed for Motions.

Short Causes, Petitions, and Adjourned
Summons on Saturday, except June
3rd and 10th.

Summons in Chambers on Friday After-
noons, Liverpool and Manchester Sum-
mons being taken on alternate Fridays,
commencing with Manchester Summons
on Friday, June 2nd.

CHANCERY COURT, III.

MR. JUSTICE ROMER.

Actions transferred for Trial or Hearing
only will be taken in the order in the
Cause List on every day of the Sittings,
from 30th May to 12th August, both in-
clusive.

COURT OF APPEAL.

TRINITY SITTINGS, 1893.

APPEAL COURT I.—NOTICES.

Queen's Bench Interlocutory Appeals will be taken in Court I. on Tues-
day, May 30, and afterwards on every Monday in Trinity Sittings.

Queen's Bench Final Appeals and New Trial Motions will be taken in
Court I. in alternate weeks during the Sittings. New Trial Motions will
be taken in Court I. on Wednesday, May 31, and following days in that
week. Final Appeals in the second week.

On Mondays and Fridays Final Appeals or New Trial Motions will be
taken if there are not enough Interlocutory or Bankruptcy Appeals for a
day's Paper.

Admiralty Appeals (with Assessors) will be taken in Court I. on days
especially appointed by the Court, notice of which will appear in the Daily
Cause List.

APPEAL COURT II.—NOTICES.

N.B.—Interlocutory Appeals from the Chancery and Probate and Divorce
Divisions will be taken in Court II. on Tuesday, May 30, and afterwards
on every Wednesday in Trinity Sittings.

If there are not enough Interlocutory Appeals for the first day, then
Final Appeals will be added.

N.B.—Subject to Chancery Interlocutory Appeals on Wednesdays,
Chancery Final Appeals will be taken every day in Court II. until further
notice.

N.B.—When the Interlocutory Appeals are not enough for a day's Paper
Chancery Final Appeals will be added on Interlocutory days.

Appeals from the Lancaster and Durham Palatine Courts (if any) will be
taken in Court II. on Thursday, June 1, on Thursday, July 6, and on
Thursday, August 3.

SPECIAL NOTICE.—In consequence of the limited state of the Appeal
List, the above general arrangement will be subject to modification by the
judges, of which due notice will appear in the Daily Cause List.

FROM THE QUEEN'S BENCH DIVISION.

For Judgment.

Callendar v Carlton Iron Co, Id. appn of plt for judgt or new trial on
app from verdict and judgt, dated April 14, at trial before the Lord
Chief Justice and a special jury in Middlesex (a v May 16—present
the Master of the Rolls and Lords Justices Lopes and A L Smith)

FROM THE CHANCERY AND PROBATE AND DIVORCE
DIVISIONS.

For Hearing.

(Final List.)

1893.

In re The Washington Diamond Mining Co, Id, and Co's Acts appl of
Liquidator from order of Mr Justice Vaughan Williams, dated Jan 28,
disallowing fees paid to unqualified directors Feb 14 (part heard April
12—S O until present sittings for further evidence as to Co's liabilities)
Divorce G Parkinson, Petur, v Mary E Parkinson, Resp, and F P Cabot,
Co-Resp app of petur G Parkinson from judgt of Mr Justice Gorell
Barnes, dated Feb 23, dismissing petn for dissolution of marriage and
for leave to adduce further evidence March 9

Worseam v Nelson app of plt from judgt of Mr Justice Kekewich, dated
July 30, 1892, on originating sums for account and redemption of mort-
gaged property April 7

Duke of Northumberland v North-Eastern Ry Co app of deft Co from
judgt of Mr Justice Romer, dated June 2, 1892 April 13

In re Eddystone Marine Insco, Id, & Co's Acts app of J & H Green-
away from judgt of Mr Justice Wright (sitting as an additional judge
of the Chancery Division), dated March 7, placing appellants on con-
tributory list April 25

Mayor, &c, of Folkestone v Brooks app of deft from judgt of Mr Justice
Wright (sitting as an additional judge of the Chancery Division) dated
March 28, declaring charge on property for paving rate April 26

In re Robert Cox, dec, Cox v Poppleton app of S Thorn & ors from order
of Mr Justice Kekewich, dated March 4, on originating sums declaring
liability of residuary estate to contribute towards payment of debts, &c
April 27

In re Morgan, dec, Morgan v Morgan app of deft from order of Mr Justice
Stirling, dated April 25, on further consideration In re Morgan, dec,
Morgan v Morgan app of plt from same order April 28

Palmer v Storey app of defts from judgt of Mr Justice Wright (sitting
as an additional judge of the Chancery Division) dated March 22,
declaring plt a creditor and not a partner for capital provided sub-
sequent to a certain date April 28

June

FROM

Battle v
dated
Tucker v
dated
Walked
dated
Chancery
Day (1
Notting
Lister &
dated
Campbel
dated
Malcolm
April
Mahon
dated
for
Lyon v
April
The Ori
Baron
May
Shaw v
April
McLean
4, at
Martin
Vaug
in co
Sangst
Vaug
coun

Moti
stated
Mr.
the di
until S
Petiti
to say
posed

Mr.
dispos
Satur
tions
Motion
tions o

Mr.
the di
until S
Petiti
is to
oppose

Mr.
for the
until S
Petiti
to say
posed

Mr.
posa
Court
Wittin
time &
List.

Mr.
they &
Mr.
Divisi
standi

Sun
Stirlin
durin

Sun
ness
excep
Mr. J
Frida
and a

FROM THE QUEEN'S BENCH AND ADMIRALTY DIVISIONS.

For Hearing.

Final List.

1893.

Battle v Anstruther app of dft from judge of Lord Justice A L Smith, dated March 21, at trial without a jury in Middlesex March 25
 Tucker v Locke-King app of plt from judge of Lord Justice A L Smith, dated March 23, at trial without a jury in Middlesex March 30
 Walker v Peirson app of dft from judge of Mr. Justice Grantham, dated March 22, at trial without a jury in Middlesex April 8
 Chancery Action Soar v Ashwell app of plt from judge of Mr. Justice Day (for Mr Justice Chitty), dated March 11, at trial without a jury at Nottingham April 10
 Lister & anr v Lane & anr app of plt from judge of Mr Justice Grantham, dated March 23, at trial without a jury in Middlesex (new trial asked for) April 14
 Campbell v Larkworthy app of plt from judge of Mr Justice Charles, dated Jan 20, at trial without a jury in Middlesex April 20
 Malcolm & anr v Voigt app of plt from judge of Mr Justice Day, dated April 19, at trial without a jury in Middlesex April 20
 Mahoney v Lowenfeld app of plt from judge of Mr Justice Charles, dated March 25, at trial with a jury at Liverpool (new trial not asked for) April 24
 Lyon v Goddard app of dft from judge of Mr Justice Wright, dated April 25, at trial without a jury in Middlesex May 1
 The Oriental Steamship Co, Id v Tylor and anr app of plt from judge of Baron Pollock, dated April 19, at trial without a jury at Guildhall May 4
 Shaw v Thorpe app of plt from judge of Justices Wills & Charles, dated April 25, at trial on special case stated without pleadings May 6
 McLean v Roberts app of plt from judge of Mr. Justice Day, dated May 4, at trial without a jury in Middlesex May 9
 Martin v Tomkinson (Q B Crown side) app of dft from judge of Justices Vaughan Williams and Bruce, dated May 4, setting aside judge for dft in county court May 16
 Sangster v Netter (Q B Crown side) app of dft from judge of Justices Vaughan Williams and Bruce, dated May 2, affirming judge for plt in county court May 16

HIGH COURT OF JUSTICE.

CHANCERY DIVISION.

TRINITY Sittings, 1893.

NOTICES RELATING TO THE CHANCERY CAUSE LIST.

Motions, Petitions, and Short Causes will be taken on the usual days stated in the Trinity Sittings Paper, with the following exceptions, viz.:—
 Mr. Justice CHITTY—In consequence of Mr. Justice Chitty sitting for the disposal of his lordship's own Witness List from Tuesday, June 13, until Saturday, June 24 (inclusive), his lordship's Motions and Unopposed Petitions during that time will be taken by Mr. Justice North—that is to say, Motions on Thursday, June 15, and Thursday, June 22; Unopposed Petitions on Saturday, June 17, and Saturday, June 24.

Mr. Justice NORTH—In consequence of Mr. Justice North sitting for the disposal of his lordship's own Witness List from Tuesday, June 27, until Saturday, July 8 (inclusive), his lordship's Motions and Unopposed Petitions during that time will be taken by Mr. Justice Chitty—that is to say, Motions on Thursday, June 29, and Thursday, July 6; Unopposed Petitions on Saturday, July 1, and Saturday, July 8.

Mr. Justice STIRLING—In consequence of Mr. Justice Stirling sitting for the disposal of his lordship's own Witness List, from Tuesday, July 11, until Saturday, July 22 (inclusive), his lordship's Motions and Unopposed Petitions during that time will be taken by Mr. Justice Kekewich—that is to say, Motions on Thursday, July 13, and Thursday, July 20; Unopposed Petitions on Saturday, July 15, and Saturday, July 22.

Mr. Justice KEKEWICH—In consequence of Mr. Justice Kekewich sitting for the disposal of his lordship's own Witness List from Tuesday, May 30, until Saturday, June 10 (inclusive), his lordship's Motions and Unopposed Petitions during that time will be taken by Mr. Justice Stirling—that is to say, Motions on Wednesday, May 31, and Thursday, June 8; Unopposed Petitions on Saturday, June 3, and Saturday, June 10.

Mr. Justice KEEKEWICH—Subject to the special arrangement for the disposal of Witness Actions, the order of business in Mr. Justice Kekewich's Court will be as detailed on the Sittings Paper. If the state of the Non-Witness List permits his lordship's own Witness List being taken at any time after Saturday, June 10, due notice will be given on the Daily Cause List.

Mr. Justice Romer will take Witness Actions every day in the order as they stand in his lordship's Cause Book.

Mr. Justice Wright (sitting as an additional Judge of the Chancery Division) will dispose of the remainder of the transferred Chancery Actions standing for trial, subject to his lordship's direction.

Summons before the Judge in Chambers.—Justices Chitty, North, Stirling, and Kekewich will sit in Court the whole day on every Monday during the Sittings to hear Chamber Summons.

Summons Adjudged into Court will be taken (subject to the Witness List) as follows:—Mr. Justice Chitty, with Non-Witness Actions, except Procedure Summons, which (if any) are taken every Saturday; Mr. Justice Stirling, with Non-Witness Actions. Mr. Justice North on Fridays and Saturdays. Mr. Justice Kekewich on Fridays and Saturdays, and also on other days as the Judges may direct.

SPECIAL NOTICE WITH REFERENCE TO THE CHANCERY WITNESS LISTS.

During the present Sittings there will be no Selected Witness List. Each Judge will sit for the disposal of his own Witness List as follows:—
 Mr. Justice Kekewich will begin on Tuesday, the 30th May, and sit continuously (Monday, the 5th June, excepted) until Saturday, the 10th June.

Mr. Justice Chitty will begin on Tuesday, the 13th June, and sit continuously (Monday, the 19th June, excepted) until Saturday, the 24th June.

Similarly Mr. Justice North will take his Witness List for the ensuing fortnight, ending Saturday, the 8th July.

Mr. Justice Stirling will take his Witness List for the next fortnight, ending July the 22nd.

If the state of the Lists will permit the Witness List being taken at other times, due notice will be given.

During the fortnight when a judge is engaged on his Witness List, Motions in Causes or Matters assigned to him (including *Ex parte* Motions, but not including Motions relating to the postponement of the Trial or Hearing of any Cause or Matter in his lordship's List), and also Unopposed Petitions assigned to him, will be heard by one of his colleagues as follows:—

Those assigned to Mr. Justice Chitty will be heard by Mr. Justice North. Those assigned to Mr. Justice North will be heard by Mr. Justice Chitty. Those assigned to Mr. Justice Stirling will be heard by Mr. Justice Kekewich.

Those assigned to Mr. Justice Kekewich will be heard by Mr. Justice Stirling.

Before Mr. Justice CHITTY.

Causes for trial (with witnesses).

Seward v Vivian act
 Sovereign Life Assurance Co v Eardley-Wilmot act
 Singer Mfrctng Co v Spence act
 In re Head, dec Gibson v Head act & m f j
 Combe v Danube Collieries and Minerals Co ld act & m f j
 The Solicitors' Government Stock Investment Trust, Id v Rushworth act (transfd from Q. B. Division)
 Attorney-General v Marsden act
 In re Seymour, dec Seymour v Seymour act
 In re Bravo, dec Gill v Carvalho act

In re Barker, dec Fox v Barker act
 Piechaczek v Morris act
 Jordeson v Burstall act
 Annandale v Sunderland, &c, Building Society act & m f j

Nicol v Myers act
 Gower v Phillips act Newport (Mon) D.R.
 Williamson v Bingham act & m f j

Whitten v Priestman act
 Carter's Medicine Co v W Graham Cox act
 Harward v Chovil act
 Lord Gerard v Liverpool, St Helens & Railway Co act

In re Scherdt's Patent No 19,510 of 1891 Petition for revocation of Patent

Cradock v Scottish Provident Institution act
 Chilworth Gunpowder Co ld v Manchester Ship Canal Co act

In re the Salvador Coffee Estates Co ld and Co's Acts Expte Wethered, motion for rectification of register, with liberty to cross-examine and adduce further evidence by order

In re Reece, dec Cosway v Reece act set down by order
 Callow v Stephenson act

Cooke v Catterall act & m f j
 Elmore v Braithwaite act

In re Reynolds' Patent No. 20,770 A.D. 1891 Petition by J B Hannam for revocation of Patent with witnesses by order

Meager v Francis act
 Western and General Development Syndicate Id v Mexican Explorations ld act

Mallman & Co v Buenos Ayres Water, &c Co act
 Homfray v Pontypridd, &c Ry Co act

Norledge v Colton act

Point of Law.

Clothworkers Co v Humphreys point of law set down by order 28 2.93

Causes for Trial (without witnesses).

Burney v Schmidt act

Neame v Dowling min judge pt hd

Staple v Staple min judge

In re Cavander, Gregory v Lane m f j

Lord Ashburton v Flint m f j

Pratt v Pratt m f j

In re Turney & Sons trade mark No

161,776 and Patents, Designs, &c,

Act motion ordered to go into non-witness list

Pearson v The Market Harborough, &c, Local Board m f j

Before Mr. Justice STIRLING.
Causes for trial (with witnesses).
Miers v Kempthorne act pt hd (June 6)
Bradley v Humphrey act
Tremoile v Christie act restored
Matebeleland Co, Id v British South Africa Co act
Holdsworth v Eylert act (Michaelmas Sittings)
Provident Permanent Building Society v Prior act
Whittington Life Assurance Society Sanderson act
In re W Beckett, dec Pauling v Hart act
Vallance v Frape act (Michaelmas Sittings)
In re Browne, Britchart v Browne act
Graham v Smith act
Mandleberg & Co, Id, v Morley act
Nobels Explosives Co, Id, v Anderson act Not before July 1
Robinson v Heygate act
Hassall v Nicholls act
Sketchley v Berger act
S Allsopp & Sons, Id, v Mayor, &c, of Burton-on-Trent act Not before July 7
Weir v Dodds act
Palmer v Wilson act
Holland v Smith act
Chappell & Co v King act S O until return of Commission
Bartholomew v D'Enison act
Brunner, Mond & Cold v Winnington Salt Co Id act
In re Wratilaw Wratilaw v Savage act
Adams v J Rotheroe & Co act
Strettons Derby Brewery Id v Mayor, &c, of Derby act
Cousens v White act
Seddon v Bateman act
Newsom v Newsom act
Cotton v Cornish Bank Id act
Denman v Kemeyes Tynte act
Nye v Hughes act
Merideth v Wilson act set down without pledges by order (27 June)
Lewis v Davies act
Poulton Smith act
Myers v Gardner act
Vitoria v De Murrieta act
Mootham v London Assec Corporation act & m f j

Before Mr. Justice KEKEWICH.
Causes for trial (with witnesses)
Managers of Metropolitan Asylums District v Vestry of Fulham Parish act
Meakin v Richardson act
Edinburgh Life Assec Co v Bodham act
Plows v Quinn act
In re Macdougall Macdougall v Macdougall act
De Campbell v Hamlyn act & m f j
Rooke v Lopez act
Foster v Frazer act
In re Blakeley Blakeley v Blakeley act
Rastrick v Southsea Steam Biscuit Co, Id act
Pole v Herbert act
Haigh v Harlech Dist Hwy Board act
Smith v Vincent act
Cartland v O'Kell act
Bunting v Hicks act
Cartwright v Sayers act transfd from Q B Div
Custance v Wilkinson act
Clements v Birmingham Art Metal Co act
George v Greener act
Bones v Bull act
Edwards v Twilley act & m f j
Blackman v Wood act
Holloway v Winch act
Roberts v Churchman act

Williams v Jones act
In re Bankes Anderson v Law Guaranteed & Trust Assec Id m & adj claim
Aspinall v Aspinall's Enamel, Id act
C de Murietta & Co, Id, v Inter-
Before Mr. Justice VAUGHAN WILLIAMS.
(Sitting as an additional Judge of Chancery Division.)
Companies (winding up).
Actions for trial.
Ellis v Ranken Ellis & Co, Id
Motions.
In re Orange Blossoms, Id, expte the Board of Trade
In re Seamless Hosiery Co, Id, expte the Board of Trade
Petitions.
Brighton Alhambra Id (petition of J J Abell)
The same (petition of A Dean)
Electrical Supplies & Fittings Co Id (petition of Electrical Co Id)
Palace Theatre Id (petition of L & H Nathan)
Standard Bank of Australia Id (petition of J Fry)
F White Id petition of J W Petty & ors
W Flatau & Sons Id (petition of T E Mann)
Woodhouse & Rawson United Id (petn of W T Henley's Telegraph Works Co Id)
Queensland National Bank Id (petn of H D Livingstone)
Queensland National Bank Id (petn of R B B Clayton)

Before Mr. Justice ROMER.
Causes for trial (with witnesses).
Contract Loan and Trust Corp, Id v Josy Metallachrome, &c, Co, Id, act
Cameron v Whitehead act
Industl Assoch of Gt Britain, Id, v Lon, Edin & Glasgow Assurance Co, Id act (Not before 31 May)
Dally v Holt act (Michaelmas Sittings)

Transferred by Order dated 20 January, 1893.

In re Bussey Bussey v Bussey act (not before 1 June)
British North American Investment Co, Id, v Cameron Freehold Land and Investment Co, Id act & m f j (1 June)
Isaac v Elliott, Elliott v Isaac act (not before 18 April)
Kenny v McCarthy act & m f j (13 June)
Burton v West act (Not before June 5)
Pryce Jones v White Lead Co, Id act (not before 12 June)
Shackford v Same Co, Id act (Not before 12 June)
Dean v Mayor, &c, of Blackpool act (Not before 1 June)
In re Lane & Taunton's Patent, 12371, A D 1886, and Patents, &c, Act Petition entered in Wits List by order (Not before 17 June)
Thomas v David act
In re Galloway, Galloway v Galloway act (Not before 30 June)

Transferred by Order dated 10 March, 1893.

Setterwall v Dorman, Brown, & Co act (Michaelmas Sittings)
Naemthy v Murdoch act
Sutherland v Sutherland act (Not before 5 June)
Day v Longhurst act & adj sums

HIGH COURT OF JUSTICE.

QUEEN'S BENCH DIVISION.

TRINITY SITTINOS, 1893.

SPECIAL PAPER.

For Argument.

The Wimbledon & Putney Commons Conservators v Nicol part heard April 19, 1893, before Mr. Justice Wills and Mr. Justice Charles (S O until after trial of action) points of law

OPPOSED MOTIONS.

For Judgment.

The Wardens, &c. of Cholmeley's School, Highgate v Sewell & ors

For Argument.

Pollock v Sharpe part heard Jan 25, 1893, before Mr Justice Day and Mr Justice Collins
In re R G Thompson, gent Expte Baylis (taxation) referred to District Registrar to report

Parker v James (S O June 12)

In re An Arbrn between the Swansea Harbour Trustees & the Gt Western Ry Co (S O June 10)

In re An Arbrn between the London County Council & the London Street Tramways Co (S O June 17)

In re An Arbrn between Same and Same (S O June 17)

Herbert v Maple Little & ors v Kent The Hawkins Hill Consolidated Gold Mining Co v Want, Johnson, & Co Brown v Wilson

Same v Same Rowland v Berriman & anr The Fourth City Mutual Benefit Bldg Soc v Richardson & ors Gonzalez, Byass & Co v Palmer

In re an Arbrn between Moser and The Security Co, Id Sequah, Id, v Danziger

Davis v Lovell In re a Solicitor Expte Incorporated Law Soc Gorse v Webb

Hood-Barrs v Cathcart Brown v Westwood & anr

Wyatt v King Richardson v Mahon & anr

Flew v Smith Musgrave v Wallis & anr

(The whole of the above lists to be continued.)

WARNING TO INTENDING HOUSE PURCHASERS & LESSERS.—Before purchasing or renting a house have the Sanitary arrangements thoroughly examined by an expert from The Sanitary Engineering & Ventilation Co., 65, next the Meteorological Office, Victoria-st., Westminster (Etab. 1875), who also undertake the Ventilation of Offices, &c.—[Adv.]

STAMMERERS of all ages successfully treated. Boys while being cured thoroughly Educated and Prepared for Examinations by a University Tutor.—Apply Mr. B. BRASLEY (who cured himself), Brampton-park, Huntingdon, or "Sherwood," Willesden-lane, Bromley, London. "Stammering: Its Treatment," post-free, 13 stamps.—[Adv.]

WINDING UP NOTICES.

London Gazette.—FRIDAY, May 28.

JOINT STOCK COMPANIES.

LIMITED IN CHANCERY.

ALLIANCE STOCK EXCHANGE, LIMITED.—Petn for winding up, presented May 19, directed to be heard on June 7. Spyer & Sons, 53, New Broad st, solors for petners. Notice of appearing must reach the abovenamed not later than 6 o'clock in the afternoon of June 6 EXETER INVESTMENT TRUST, LIMITED.—Petn for winding up, presented April 24, and directed to be heard on May 17, was adjourned until June 7. Taylor & Co, 23, Great James st, Bedford row, solors for petner. Notice of appearing must reach the abovenamed not later than 6 o'clock in the afternoon of June 6

MERCANTILE FINANCE TRUSTERS AND AGENCY CO OF AUSTRALIA, LIMITED.—Petn for winding up, presented May 17, directed to be heard on June 7. Burchell & Co, 5, Sanctuary, Westminster, solors for petner. Notice of appearing must reach the abovenamed not later than 6 o'clock in the afternoon of June 6

ROYAL BANK OF QUEENSLAND, LIMITED.—Petn for winding up, presented May 21, directed to be heard on June 7. Wilkins & Co, 112, Gresham House, Old Broad st, solors for petners. Notice of appearing must reach the abovenamed not later than 6 o'clock in the afternoon of June 6

J E WANNER, LIMITED.—Creditors are required, on or before June 21, to send their names and addresses, and the particulars of their debts or claims, to Trayton Padgen Child, 42, Poultry. Reader & Co, 7, Ely pl, Holborn, solors for liquidator

WESTWOOD, BAILLIE, & CO, LIMITED.—Petn for winding up, presented May 18, directed to be heard on Wednesday, June 7. W H Martin & Co, 15, King st, Cheapside, solors for petners. Notice of appearing must reach the abovenamed not later than 6 o'clock in the afternoon of June 6

UNLIMITED IN CHANCERY.

COMMERCIAL BANKING CO OF SYDNEY.—Petn for winding up, presented May 16, directed to be heard on Wednesday, June 7. Linklater & Co, 2, Bond st, Walbrook. Notice of appearing must reach the abovenamed not later than 6 o'clock in the afternoon of June 6

COUNTY PALATINE OF LANCASSTER.

LIMITED IN CHANCERY.

LIVERPOOL SYNDICATE, LIMITED.—By an order made by the court, dated May 15, it was ordered that the voluntary winding up of the Co be continued. And it was ordered that Edward Darbyshire, George Hay Stuart, and Walter Thomas Kean, the liquidators, be removed, and that it be referred to the registrar to appoint two proper persons. Killey, Liverpool, solor for petners

London Gazette.—TUESDAY, May 30.

JOINT STOCK COMPANIES.

LIMITED IN CHANCERY.

LIGHTHOUSE, LIMITED.—Creditors are required, on or before July 1, to send their names and addresses, and the particulars of their debts or claims, to William G Blakemore, 21, Coleman st, Vernon & Co, Coleman st, solors for liquidator

MIDLAND COAL, COKE, AND IRON CO. LIMITED.—Petition for winding up, presented May 24, directed to be heard on June 7. Friday, 9, Old Broad st, solars for partners. Notice of appearing must reach the abovenamed not later than 6 o'clock in the afternoon of June 6.

MIDLAND COAL, COKE, AND IRON CO. LIMITED.—Petition for winding up, presented May 24, directed to be heard on June 7. Robinson & Co., 35, Lincoln's Inn fields, agents for Hollinshead & Moody, Tunstall, partners' solars. Notice of appearing must reach Robinson & Co. not later than 6 o'clock in the afternoon of June 6.

MIDLAND COAL, COKE, AND IRON CO. LIMITED.—Petition for winding up, presented May 27, directed to be heard on Wednesday, June 7. J. H. P. Chitty, 10, New st, Carey st, solar for partner. Notice of appearing must reach the abovenamed not later than 6 o'clock in the afternoon of June 6.

ROCHDALE SECULAR HALL CO. LIMITED.—Creditors are required, on or before July 8, to send their names and addresses, and the particulars of their debts or claims, to Peter Ashton, 24, Freehold st, Rochdale. Calvert, Rochdale, solar for liquidators.

VOLCANIC AERATION CO. LIMITED.—Petition for winding up, presented May 15, directed to be heard on June 7. Wrenst & Sharp, Finsbury sq, solar for partner.

UNLIMITED IN CHANCERY.

RHYL DISTRICT WATER CO.—Creditors are required to send in the particulars of their claims on or before July 15. John Bayliss, Rhyll District Water Offices, Paradise st, Rhyll.

FRIENDLY SOCIETIES DISSOLVED.

AMICABLE FRIENDLY SOCIETY, Adderbury, Oxford. May 24.

BIRMINGHAM BENEFIT SOCIETY, Bishop Bonner, Bonner st, Green st. May 24.

EVERSHOT AND DISTRICT CO-OPERATIVE SOCIETY, LIMITED, Evershot, Dorset. May 24.

OPERATIVE JUSTICE MANCHESTER AND SALFORD BURIAL SOCIETY, 203, Oldham rd, Manchester. May 23.

SUSPENDED FOR THREE MONTHS.

CLEVELAND SICK BENEFIT SOCIETY, Ship Inn, Marske by the Sea, York. May 24.

EQUITABLE PROVIDENT SICK AND BURIAL SOCIETY, 29, Corporation st, Manchester. May 24.

EVAN AB BEVAN LODGE, I O True Inviters, St David's Unity Friendly Society, Welcome to Town Inn, Neath, Glamorgan. May 25.

PHOENIX LODGE OF ANCIENT SHEPHERDS FRIENDLY SOCIETY, New Bull Inn, Kirkham, Lancaster. May 25.

BANKRUPTCY NOTICES.

London Gazette.—FRIDAY, May 26.

RECEIVING ORDERS.

AARON, ALFRED GABRIEL, Aldersgate st, Umbrella Manufacturer. High Court Pet May 24, Ord May 24.

ALLEN, HENRY, Northampton, Boot Manufacturer. Northampton Pet May 23, Ord May 23.

BANKS, HUGH, Wigton, Esq. Wigton Pet May 5, Ord May 24.

CURRY, JOHN THOMAS, Lyndhurst rd, Peckham, Grocer. High Court Pet May 20, Ord May 20.

DOUGLAS, KEITH KEITH, Chester, Insurance Agent. Chester Pet May 12, Ord May 24.

DRURY, CHARLES RICHARDSON, Broadway, Worcs, Hotel Proprietor. Worcester Pet May 23, Ord May 23.

EVANS, JOHN, Mumbls, nr Swanes, Chemist. Swanes Pet May 24, Ord May 24.

GOODLIFE, HARRY, Springfield, Essex, Mineral Water Manufacturer. Chelmsford Pet May 20, Ord May 20.

GUNNISON, PEARSON, Wainfleet All Saints, Lincs, Grocer. Boston Pet May 23, Ord May 23.

HUNT, HERBERT, late of Parkerton, Essex, Grocer. Colchester Pet May 1, Ord May 24.

INCH, JAMES, Fenchurch st, Colonial Agent. High Court Pet May 24, Ord May 24.

LEES, JOSEPH, Aston, Birmingham, Confectioner. Birmingham Pet May 19, Ord May 23.

NETTLETON, GEORGE JOHN, Rammage, Tobacconist. Canterbury Pet May 23, Ord May 23.

PALMER, F. A., Bromsgrove, Worcs, Butcher. Worcester Pet May 15, Ord May 24.

POND, CHARLES, Albany art yard, Piccadilly. High Court Pet April 25, Ord May 24.

POWELL, LEWIS, Treherri, Glam, Greengrocer. Merthyr Tydfil Pet May 23, Ord May 23.

PURSER, WILLIAM THOMAS, Northampton, House Decorator. Northampton Pet May 20, Ord May 20.

RAB, FRANK, late Coldharbour lane, Camberwell, late Beerhouse Keeper. High Court Pet May 8, Ord May 24.

RICHARDSON, LOUISA BEATRICE, Ashford, Kent, Baker. Canterbury Pet May 23, Ord May 23.

SEALBY, JOHN WRIGHT, Berwick st, Oxford st, Contractor. High Court Pet May 24, Ord May 24.

SMITH, WATSON, New Broad st, Accountant. High Court Pet May 23, Ord May 23.

WATKINS, BENJAMIN, Merthyr Tydfil, Grocer. Merthyr Tydfil Pet May 23, Ord May 23.

FIRST MEETINGS.

ABRAHAMS, ISAAC, Basinghall st, June 12 at 2.30. Bankruptcy bldgs, Carey st.

ATKIN, WILLIAM, Stamford, Tailor. June 14 at 12. Law Courts, New st, Peterborough.

AYLMER, J. E. F., Bishopsgate i. st, June 12 at 12. Bankruptcy bldgs, Carey st.

BAUKE, ELIZA, Chatsworth rd, Forest lane, Stratford, Baker. June 6 at 1. Bankruptcy bldgs, Carey st.

BLACK, JOHN, Newcastle st, Strand, Exhibition Promoter. June 5 at 2.30. Bankruptcy bldgs, Carey st.

BLAKE, WILLIAM, Blackawton, Devon, Farmer. June 6 at 11. Atheneum st, Plymouth.

BONACINA, LODOVICO, Fenchurch avenue, Merchant. June 5 at 12. Bankruptcy bldgs, Carey st.

BOSTON, THOMAS, Milk st, Cheapside, Manufacturer's Agent. June 5 at 11. Bankruptcy bldgs, Carey st.

COOMBES, CHARLES, Sturminster Newton, Dorset, Boot Maker. June 3 at 1. Off Rec, Salisbury.

CROSHNEY, ERNEST, Leadenhall st, Solicitor. June 6 at 2.30. Bankruptcy bldgs, Carey st.

DENNELL, JAMES FRID, AND ANDREW CLIFFORD DENNELL, Hill st, Upper Clapton, Fancy Stationers. June 5 at 1. Bankruptcy bldgs, Carey st.

DENNISON, A. M., Upper Thames st, June 6 at 1. Bankruptcy bldgs, Carey st.

EVANS, FITZWILLIAM RICHMOND AUGUSTUS, Birmingham, Surgeon. June 6 at 11. 23, Colmore row, Birmingham.

FRISTON, WILLIAM SPINK, Rattlesden, Suffolk, Farmer. June 6 at 3.30. Off Rec, 36, Princes st, Ipswich.

GAMBLE, HENRY (esp estate), Handsworth, Staffs, Manufacturer. June 7 at 11. 23, Colmore row, Birmingham.

GEE, JOHN, Collyweston, Northamptonshire, Publican. June 14 at 12. Law Courts, New rd, Peterborough.

GEORGE, RICHARD CAMPBELL, Carmarthen, Clothier. June 3 at 11. Off Rec, 11, Quay st, Carmarthen.

GOODCHILD, JAMES, St Albans, Plumber. June 5 at 3. Off Rec, 95, Temple chmbrs, Temple avenue.

GREENWOOD, BUTTLIFFE, Todmorden, Yorks, Coal Agent. June 7 at 3.30. Exchange Hotel, Nicholas st, Bursley.

HEYSE, FERDINAND, Seething lane, Commission Merchant. June 6 at 12. Bankruptcy bldgs, Carey st.

HUNDY, JAMES, High st, Shorelitch, Millowner. June 2 at 12. Bankruptcy bldgs, Carey st.

JOHNSON, THOMAS, Romola rd, Herne Hill, Gent. June 2 at 1. Bankruptcy bldgs, Carey st.

LEWIS, WILLIAM (jun), Cattistock, Dorset, Farmer. June 2 at 12.15. Antelope Hotel, Dorchester.

MC SHEEN, RICHARD, Great Grimsby, Shipping Clerk. June 3 at 11. Off Rec, 15, Osborne st, Great Grimsby.

MILLER, MARIA ANN, Market Harborough, Butcher. June 5 at 3. Off Rec, 34, Friars lane, Leicester.

MORRIS, MAUDIE, Elgin avenue, Maida Vale, Widow. June 5 at 12. Bankruptcy bldgs, Carey st.

PAYNE, GEORGE, Erdington, Warwickshire, Plumber. June 7 at 2.30. Colmore row, Birmingham.

RAE, JAMES, Tynemouth, Board of Trade Surveyor. June 5 at 11.30. Off Rec, Pink lane, Newcastle on Tyne.

REYNOLDS, IVANHOR HEYWOOD, and HENRY GAMBLE, Birmingham, Manufacturers. June 7 at 11. 23, Colmore row, Birmingham.

REYNOLDS, IVANHOR HEYWOOD (Separate Estate), King's Heath, Wm. Manufacturer. June 7 at 11. 23, Colmore row, Birmingham.

ROBINSON, ARTHUR FREDERICK, Halstead, Essex, Auctioneer. June 9 at 11.30. Townhall, Colchester.

RYLANDS, DAN, Rylands Main Colliery, nr Barnsley, Colliery Proprietor. June 5 at 3. Law Society, Bank st, Sheffield.

SFRATLEY, JOHN, Luton, Beds, Tent Proprietor. June 5 at 11. Red Lion Hotel, Luton.

TAYLOR, JAMES, Fleetcote, nr Preston, Platelayer. June 9 at 3. Off Rec, 4, Chapel st, Preston.

TURNER, JOHN, Barnstaple, Coal Merchant. June 6 at 11. King's Arms Hotel, High st, Barnstaple.

WESTLAKE, JAMES, St Dunstan's rd, Bow Common lane, Metal Refiner. June 2 at 11. Bankruptcy bldgs, Carey st.

WHITE, CHARLES, West Smethwick, Staffs, Journeyman Baker. June 16 at 2. County Court, West Bromwich.

WILLIAMS, HENRY, late of Edgeley, Cheshire, Civil Engineer. June 5 at 2.30. Bankruptcy bldgs, Carey st.

WILLIAMS, SARAH ELIZABETH, Ceele Park, Crouch End, Spinster. June 2 at 2.30. Bankruptcy bldgs, Carey st.

WILLS, JAMES, Wigwell, Ipplepen, Devon, Gardener. June 2 at 10.30. Off Rec, 13, Bedford circus, Exeter.

WILSON, HENRY DIXON, Gateshead, Commission Agent. June 5 at 12. Off Rec, Pink lane, Newcastle on Tyne.

ADJUDICATIONS.

ATCHISON, ROBERT JOHN, Heaton Junction, Newcastle on Tyne, Coal Merchant. Newcastle on Tyne Pet May 9 Ord May 20.

BLAKE, WILLIAM, late of Blackawton, Devon, Farmer. East Stonehouse Pet May 18, Ord May 24.

BRACKHAN, FREDERICK CHARLES, Worcester, Grocer. Worcester Pet May 18, Ord May 23.

CARTLIDGE, JOHN, Longton, Staffs, Builder. Longton Pet May 15, Ord May 21.

CHAMPESS, AUGUSTUS, Brighton, Sussex, Provision Dealer. Brighton Pet May 16, Ord May 23.

COTTIS, SAMUEL, Leeds, Inland Revenue Officer. Leeds Pet April 13, Ord May 19.

DARBY, WILLIAM ALFRED, Kettering, Baker. Northampton Pet May 18, Ord May 18.

EDMONDS, GEORGE WILLIAM, late Charing Cross rd, late Licensed Victualler. High Court Pet Mar 21, Ord May 20.

EVANS, JOHN, Cwmavon, Glam, Boot Dealer. Neath Pet May 20, Ord May 20.

FAQUHARSON, EDWARD GEORGE, Naval and Military Club, Piccadilly, Gent. High Court Pet Mar 21, Ord May 20.

CREDITORS' NOTICES. UNDER ESTATES IN CHANCERY.

LAST DAY OF CLAIM.

London Gazette.—TUESDAY, May 9.

LUND, RICHARD, Blackley, nr Manchester, Farmer. June 6. England v Lund, Registrar Manchester. Jones, Southport.

London Gazette.—FRIDAY, May 12.

FREELING, FRANCIS HENRY, St Heliers, Jersey, Postmaster. June 12. Shirer and Haddon v Freelng, Chitty, J. Le Brassier, New of Lincoln's inn.

HEELIS, AMELIA, Mistled st, Brixton Hill. June 3. Upton v Higham, Stirling, J. Farson, Bucklebury.

LAKELAND, HENRY, Northleigh, Honiton, Devon. May 25. Philip v Lakeland, Kekewich, J. Behrend, Bucklebury.

LENG, GEORGE, Winston, Durham, Farmer. June 3. Tarn v Emerson, Registrar, Durham. Holmes, Barnard Caudle.

PAGE, GEORGE, Birmingham, Gentleman. June 12. National Bank of Wales, Llan v Page, Chitty, J. Corbin, Gresham st.

London Gazette.—FRIDAY, May 19.

SEDOV, THOMAS HAWKESHEAD, Westhoughton, Lancashire, Cotton Manufacturer. June 19. Manchester and County Bank, Limited v Seddon, and Seddon v Seddon, Registrar, Manchester. Orrell, Manchester.

London Gazette.—TUESDAY, May 23.

HIDE, THOMAS, East Oakley, Wootton Saint Lawrence, Southampton, Farmer. June 15. Garrett v Garrett, Stirling, J. Webb & Lear, Basingstoke.

JONES, RICHARD FREDERICK, Bristol, Gentleman. June 19. Pritchard v Emett, Kekewich, J. Francis, Bristol.

MARTIN, SIDNEY TRICE, Brookwood rd, Wandsworth Common, out of business. June 23. Kendal Milne & Co v Martin, Registrar, Manchester. Jones, Manchester.

London Gazette.—TUESDAY, May 23.

HIDE, THOMAS, East Oakley, Wootton Saint Lawrence, Southampton, Farmer. June 15. Garrett v Garrett, Stirling, J. Webb & Lear, Basingstoke.

JONES, RICHARD FREDERICK, Bristol, Gentleman. June 19. Pritchard v Emett, Kekewich, J. Francis, Bristol.

MARTIN, SIDNEY TRICE, Brookwood rd, Wandsworth Common, out of business. June 23. Kendal Milne & Co v Martin, Registrar, Manchester. Jones, Manchester.

London Gazette.—TUESDAY, May 23.

GAX, JOHN, Collyweston, Northamptonshire, Publican. Peterborough Pet May 20, Ord May 20.

GILPIN, HENRY, Birmingham, Wholesale Jeweller. Birmingham Pet May 19, Ord May 23.

GUNSON, FRASER, Walsfield, All Saints, Lincs, Greer Boston Pet May 20, Ord May 23.

GUTTERIDGE, RICHARD SANDON, Brook st, Grosvenor st, Physician. High Court Pet Mar 11, Ord May 21.

INCH, JAMES, Fenchurch st, Colonial Agent. High Court Pet May 24, Ord May 24.

KRANE, CHARLES AUGUSTUS, Pembridge cres, Notting Hill, retired Governor of one of H.M. Prisons. High Court Pet April 10, Ord May 23.

KING, EMMA ELLEN, Westbourne, Bournemouth, late Corn Merchant. Poole Pet April 18, Ord May 19.

LANGTRY, ALBERT SIMS, Waterlooville, Hants, Baker. Portsmouth Pet May 15, Ord May 20.

LARDNER, JOHN JOSEPH, Pleasant grove, York rd, King's Cross, N. Northern Gold Melting Co. High Court Pet April 6, Ord May 19.

LEES, JOSEPH, Aston, Birmingham, Confectioner. Birmingham Pet May 19, Ord May 23.

NANSON, HENRY, St Winchester st, Solicitor. High Court Pet April 5, Ord May 20.

NEWTON, HARRY ISAAC, Victoria st, High Court Pet Feb 17, Ord May 19.

OBSE, ALFRED JOHN, and ALBERT GRAHAM, late Victoria st, High Court Pet Mar 2, Ord May 19.

PAYNE, GEORGE, Erdington, Warwickshire, Plumber. Birmingham Pet May 19, Ord May 23.

POTTER, WALTER, Cold Harbour lane, Brixton, Egg Merchant. High Court Pet April 28, Ord May 23.

POWELL, LEWIS, Treherri, Glam, Greengrocer. Merthyr Tydfil Pet May 23, Ord May 23.

PURSER, WILLIAM THOMAS, Northampton, House Decorator. Northampton Pet May 20, Ord May 20.

RAE, JAMES, Tynemouth, Board of Trade Surveyor. Newcastle on Tyne Pet May 8, Ord May 18.

ROBERTS, CHARLES FREDERICK, Kingston upon Hull, Draper. Kingston upon Hull Pet April 28, Ord May 23.

SCHMITTEN, PAUL, Walpole st, Chelsea, Wine Merchant. High Court Pet Jan 19, Ord May 18.

SEALBY, JOHN WRIGHT, Berwick st, Oxford st, Contractor. High Court Pet May 24, Ord May 24.

SMITH, JOSEPH WILLIAM, Watford, Herts, Grocer. St Albans Pet May 19, Ord May 19.

SOUTH, ERNEST H., Cophall chmbrs, Stock Broker. High Court Pet Mar 17, Ord May 20.

STEELES, ROBERT, Leeds, Hat Manufacturer. Leeds Pet May 20, Ord May 20.

TIDY, JAMES JONATHAS, Horsham, Sussex, Colt Breaker. Brighton Pet May 18, Ord May 23.

WADDINGTON, JOSEPH EDWARD, Blackburn, H. & B. Beer. Blackburn Pet May 10, Ord May 19.

WATKINS, BENJAMIN, Merthyr Tydfil, Grocer. Merthyr Tydfil Pet May 23, Ord May 23.

WEBB, EDWARD, Abingdon, Berks, Tobaccoist. Oxford Pet May 19, Ord May 19.

WILLS, JAMES, Wigwell, Ipplepen, Devon, Gardener. Exeter Pet May 19, Ord May 19.

ADJUDICATION ANNULLED.

WINDSOR, WILLIAM TESSIMOND, Chorlton on Medlock, Grey Cloth Salesman. Manchester Adjud Aug 7, 1891 Annual May 16.

RECEIVING ORDERS.

ALLCHURCH, WILLIAM THOMAS, Birmingham, Grocer. Birmingham Pet May 27, Ord May 27.

ANDREWS, GEORGE JAMES, Bridge, Hungerford, Berks, late Miller. Newbury Pet May 28, Ord May 28.

ARMISHAW, FREDERICK, Haughton, Staffs, Farmer. Stafford Pet May 25, Ord May 25.

ATHERTON, THOMAS, York, Plumber. York Pet May 23, Ord May 23.

ATKINS, JOHN, Stafford, formerly Farmer. Stafford Pet May 24, Ord May 24.

BEER, GEORGE, Dodbrooke, nr Kingbridge, Devon, Boot Maker. East Stow Pet May 25, Ord May 25.

BURCHAM, JOHN WILLIAM, Leicester, Coal Merchant Leicestershire Pet May 26 Ord May 26	ARCHER, FRED, Chertsey, Surrey, Saddler June 7 at 11.30	ARNISHAW, FREDERICK, Haughton, Staffs, Farmer Stafford Pet May 25 Ord May 25
BUTT, THOMAS, Callow, Wors, Farmer Worcester Pet May 27 Ord May 27	ATHENLEY, THOMAS, York, Plumber June 8 at 2.30 Off Rec, York	ATKINS, JOHN, Stafford, formerly Farmer Stafford Pet May 24 Ord May 24
CHARLETON, W T, West Woodburn, Northumbld, Farmer Newcastle on Tyne Pet May 11 Ord May 25	ATKINS, JOHN, Stafford, formerly Farmer June 8 at 11.30 St Martin's Place, Stafford	BUTT, THOMAS, Callow, Wors, Farmer Worcester Pet May 27 Ord May 27
CHARTRES, EDWARD, Graham st, Eating House Keeper High Court Pet May 25 Ord May 25	BANKS, HUGH, Winstanley Hall, nr Wigton, Esq June 6 at 10.45 Court house, King st, Wigton	COMPTON, HENRY, Nydd, Yorks, late Butler York Pet May 19 Ord May 27
COOKE, JOE, Sheffield, Fish Dealer Sheffield Pet May 25 Ord May 25	BROWN, WILLIAM, Liverpool, Furniture Polisher June 7 at 2 Off Rec, 25 Victoria st, Liverpool	COOKE, JOE, Sheffield, Fish Dealer Sheffield Pet May 21 Ord May 25
COOMBES, THOMAS, Patten, Anerley, Surrey, Stationer Croydon Pet May 26 Ord May 26	CARTER, GEORGE, Guildford, Surrey, Boot Maker June 9 at 11.30 24, Railway approach, London Bridge	COOMBS, THOMAS, Patten, Anerley, Surrey, Stationer Croydon Pet May 26 Ord May 26
COMPTON, HENRY, Nydd, Yorks, late Butler York Pet May 27 Ord May 27	CHAMPSNESS, AUGUSTUS, Brighton, Provision Dealer June 7 at 12 Off Rec, 4, Pavilion bridge, Brighton	CRAGO, HARRY, Gosport, Tobacconist Portsmouth Pet May 25 Ord May 25
CRAGO, HARRY, Gosport, Tobacconist Portsmouth Pet May 25 Ord May 25	COMPTON, HENRY, Nydd, Yorks, late Butler June 6 at 12 Off Rec, Henry	CRICK, JOHN, Aberkenfig, Glam, Tailor Cardiff Pet May 25 Ord May 25
CRICK, JOHN, Aberkenfig, Glam, Tailor Cardiff Pet May 25 Ord May 25	COX, THOMAS, Beckenham, Kent, Builder June 6 at 11.30 24, Railway approach, London Bridge	DEACON, WILLIAM, CARTER, Newbury, Berks, Saddler Newbury Pet May 24 Ord May 24
CROWNELL, ELIZABETH, Sheffield, Music Hall Proprietress Sheffield Pet May 25 Ord May 25	CROOKS, GEORGE, Ercote, Kidderminster Foreign, Wors, Gamekeeper June 7 at 2.15 Miller Corbet, Solicitor, Kidderminster	DENNISON, ALFRED, MICHAEL, Upper Thames-street High Court Pet April 24 Ord May 25
DEACON, WILLIAM, CARTER, Newbury, Berks, Saddler Newbury Pet May 24 Ord May 24	CURRY, JOHN, THOMAS, Lyndhurst rd, Peckham, Grocer June 13 at 11 Bankruptcy bldgs, Carey st	GARLICK, MARY, AGNES, Kingston upon Hull, Widow Kingston upon Hull Pet May 3 Ord May 25
FELL, JAMES, NEWBURY, Butcher Newbury Pet May 26 Ord May 26	FARRELL, JAMES, Abbey st, Bermondsey, Licensed Victualler, June 7 at 11 Bankruptcy bldgs, Carey st	GLOVER, JAMES, Leicester, Machinist Leicester Pet May 26 Ord May 26
GIBSONS, JAMES, BURT, Maria Lane, Chemical Merchant High Court Pet May 5 Ord May 20	FLATAU, J. N., 64 Winchester st, Commission Agent June 6 at 2.30 Bankruptcy bldgs, Carey st	GREENWAY, JOSEPH, ELTON, H. M. Prison, Wormwood Scrubs, late Auctioneers High Court Pet April 19 Ord May 26
GLOVERS, WILLIAM, Leicester, Machinist Leicester Pet May 26 Ord May 26	GLANVILLE, JOHN, EASBY, Stock, Devonport, Builder June 6 at 12 10, Atheneum ter, Plymouth	HALDEMAN, JOHN, Camden Hill rd, Upper Norwood High Court Pet April 19 Ord May 26
HARDING, HARRY, BERTRAND, Sutherland st, Fimlico, formerly Licensed Victualler High Court Pet May 26 Ord May 26	GRIFFIN, DAVID, Neath, Glam, Grocer June 6 at 11 Off Rec, Bank chbrs, Corn st, Bristol	HENKEY, MARY, Wolverhampton, Clothier Wolverhampton Pet May 24 Ord May 25
HENLEY, MARK, Wolverhampton, Clothier Wolverhampton Pet May 24 Ord May 25	GRIFFITHS, WILLIAM, Neath, Glam, Grocer June 6 at 12 Off Rec, Bank chbrs, Corn st, Bristol	HUTTER, J. EDMUND, Mincing lane, Broker High Court Pet Mar 23 Ord May 26
HEYWOOD, HARVEY, George, Bridge rd, Hammersmith, Builder High Court Pet April 12 Ord May 26	GRIFFITHS, WILLIAM, JOHN, Shrewsbury, Grocer June 7 at 12 Bankruptcy bldgs, Corn st	JAHAN, JOHN, JAMES, Farnham, Hants, General House Painter, Portsmouth Pet May 25 Ord May 25
HEYGATE, WILLIAM, HARRIS, Cotham, Hants, Surgeon Portsmouth Pet May 8 Ord May 25	GUNSON, PEARSON, Wanstead All Saints, Lincs, Grocer June 8 at 13 Off Rec, 48, High st, Boston	JONES, F. W., late Fortune Gate ter, Hanley, late Butcher High Court Pet Mar 30 Ord May 26
JARMAN, JOHN, JAMES, Farnham, Hants, General House Furnisher Portsmouth Pet May 25 Ord May 25	HARROD, JOHN, and FREDERICK CHARLES HARROD, Hanley, Earthenware Manufacturers June 8 at 11.30 North Stafford Hotel, Stoke upon Trent	LONGUERHATE, WILLIAM, HENRY, Sidcup, Kent, Gent Croydon Pet April 7 Ord May 26
LEWIS, LEMUEL, Llanwit Fardre, Glam, Innkeeper Pontypridd Pet May 26 Ord May 26	HUNT, HERBERT, late Parkstone, Essex, Grocer June 6 at 2.45 Off Rec, 30, Princes st, Ipswich	LOED, JOHN, ROBERT, Norwich, Coal Merchant Norwich Pet May 26 Ord May 26
LIGGINS, HARRY, Nunton, Warwickshire, Baker Coven-try Pet May 25 Ord May 25	JENSON, JOHN, Preston, Coal Dealer June 9 at 2.30 Off Rec, 14, Chapel st, Preston	LOWE, WILLIAM, Kingwinford, Staffs, Working Moulder Stourbridge Pet May 18 Ord May 26
LOED, JOHN, ROBERT, Norwich, Coal Merchant Norwich Pet May 26 Ord May 26	LONGOURHATE, WILLIAM HENRY, Sidcup, Kent, Gent June 6 at 12.30 24, Railway app, London bridge	MERRIFIELD, JOHN, Burnley, formerly Grocer Burnley Pet May 27 Ord May 27
LOWE, WILLIAM, Kingwinford, Staffs, Working Moulder Stourbridge Pet May 18 Ord May 26	LOVELL, ERNEST, HANOLD, Halsbury, Devon, Draper June 6 at 2 King's Arms Hotel, High st, Barnstaple	MORRIS, MARIAN, MAUD, Eglin avenue, Maida Vale, Widow High Court Pet Mar 8 Ord May 25
MACHILL, JOHN, Batley Carr, Yorks, Bag Merchant Dewsbury Pet May 17 Ord May 20	PASCAL, JAMES, STRAND, Glos, Draper June 6 at 3 Imperial Hotel, Stroud	PALMER, F. A., Bromsgrove, Wors, Butcher Worcester Pet May 15 Ord May 25
MARTIN, JOHN, RICHARD, Challey, nr Lewes, Sussex, Baker Lewes Pet May 25 Ord May 25	POND, CHARLES, Albany court yard, Piccadilly June 7 at 9.30 Bankruptcy bldgs, Carey st	POWIS, JAMES, NEWPORT, Mon, Wheelwright Newport, Mon Pet May 27 Ord May 27
McDOUGAL, ALLAN, Liverpool, late Team Owner Liverpool Pet May 27 Ord May 27	RAD, FRANK, late Coldharbour lane, Camberwell, late Beerhouse Keeper June 7 at 12 Bankruptcy bldgs, Carey st	ROBINSON, BEN, ARMLEY, nr Leeds, Boot Manufacturer Leeds Pet May 25 Ord May 25
MERRIFIELD, JOHN, Burnley, formerly Grocer Burnley Pet May 27 Ord May 27	RAMSBOTTOM, JAMES HENRY, Accrington, formerly Butcher June 14 at 2 County Court house, Blackburn	ROE, GEORGE EDWARD, SWANSEA, Saddler Swansea Pet May 18 Ord May 24
PASLOW, JOHN, Batley, Yorks, Oil Extractor Dewsbury Pet May 20 Ord May 20	RICHARDS, RICHARD, ARGOED, Mon, late Colliery Proprietor June 6 at 12 Off Rec, Merthyr Tydfil	ROSENSTEIN, PHILIP, Leeds, Sponge Dealer Leeds Pet May 25 Ord May 25
POWIS, JAMES, NEWPORT, Mon, Wheelwright Newport, Mon Pet May 27 Ord May 27	ROE, GEORGE EDWARD, SWANSEA, Saddler June 7 at 12 Off Rec, 31, Alexandra rd, Swansea	RUBEN, J. SALTER, ST. BETHNAL GREEN, Cabinet Maker High Court Pet April 15 Ord May 25
ROBINSON, ABRAHAM, St Mark st, Dalston, High Court Pet April 8 Ord May 24	SANDERSON, JULIAN, FREDERICK, late Stock Exchange June 8 at 2.30 Bankruptcy bldgs, Carey st	SALMON, RICHARD JOHN, HEMPTON GREEN, NORFOLK, Publican NORWICH Pet May 27 Ord May 27
ROBINSON, BEN, ARMLEY, nr LEEDS, Boot Manufacturer LEEDS Pet May 25 Ord May 25	SHACKLEYTON, ARTHUR, Bradford, Staffs Manufacturer June 8 at 11 Off Rec, 81, Manor row, Bradford	SNOW, WILLIAM CLEMENT WHITE, Felixstowe, Suffolk Medical Practitioner Ipswich Pet May 18 Ord May 26
ROSENSTEIN, PHILIP, Leeds, Sponge Dealer Leeds Pet May 25 Ord May 25	SHERBATT, GEORGE, Heaton, Staffs, Farmer June 6 at 11 Off Rec, 23, King Edward rd, Macleodfield	SUTCLIFFE, HARRISON, Whitwood Mere, Castleford, Yorks, Green Grocer Wakefield Pet May 27 Ord May 27
SALMON, RICHARD JOHN, HEMPTON GREEN, NORFOLK, Publican NORWICH Pet May 27 Ord May 27	SKIPPING, TOM HENRY, Dewsbury, Slop Dyer June 6 at 3 Off Rec, Bank chbrs, Batley	WATTS, JOHN HUNTER, SEETHING LANE, CHEMIST HIGH COURT Pet Mar 18 Ord May 26
SIMONDS, WILLIAM HENRY JAMES, Reading, Builder's Manager Reading Pet May 26 Ord May 26	SMITH, WILLIAM McGRIGOR, Sinclair rd, West Kensington June 7 at 2.30 Bankruptcy bldgs, Carey st	WHITTING, ROBERT, BISHOPSTON, HORFIELD, GLO, PLASTERER BRISTOL Pet May 27 Ord May 27
SNOW, WILLIAM CLEMENT WHITE, Felixstowe, Suffolk Medical Practitioner Ipswich Pet May 23 Ord May 23	SNOOK, WILLIAM CLEMENT WHITE, Felixstowe, Suffolk Medical Practitioner June 6 at 2.15 Off Rec, 26, Priory st, Ipswich	WILLIAMS, SARAH ELIZABETH, CECILE PARK, CROUCH END, SPINSTER HIGH COURT Pet May 15 Ord May 25
SUTCLIFFE, HARRISON, Whitwood Mere, Castleford, Yorks, Green Grocer Wakefield Pet May 27 Ord May 27	STRANAK, ERNST, MANOR PARK, Essex, Hotelkeeper June 9 at 11 Bankruptcy bldgs, Carey st	WRIGHT, JOHN HARRY, Peterborough, Carter Peterborough Pet May 24 Ord May 27
WHITTING, ROBERT, Bishopston, Horfield, Glos, Plasterer Bristol Pet May 27 Ord May 27	UNWIN, THOMAS JAMES, BAGET, ST. PER, Perfumer June 7 at 12 Bankruptcy bldgs, Carey st	
WRIGHT, JOHN HARRY, Peterborough, Carter Peterborough Pet May 27 Ord May 27	VOCIE, HANNIBAL JOHN, Kidderminster, Corn Merchant June 6 at 3 Off Rec, Whitehall chbrs, Colmore row, Birmingham	
FIRST MEETINGS.	WEBB, EDWARD, Abingdon, Berks, Tobacconist June 6 at 3.30, 1, ST. ALDAE'S, OXFORD	
AARON, ALFRED GABRIEL, Aldergate st, Umbrella Manufacturer June 12 at 11 Bankruptcy bldgs, Carey st	WEIGHT, JAMES WILLIAM, BUCKLESBURY, Stockbroker June 8 at 12 Bankruptcy bldgs, Carey st	
	ADJUDICATIONS.	
ANDREWS, GEORGE JAMES, BRIDGE, HUNTERFORD, BERKS, late MILLER NEWBURY Pet May 25 Ord May 26	ANDREWS, GEORGE JAMES, BRIDGE, HUNTERFORD, BERKS, late MILLER NEWBURY Pet May 25 Ord May 26	

NATIONAL DISCOUNT COMPANY, LIMITED,

35, CORNHILL, LONDON, E.C.

Subscribed Capital, £4,233,325.

Paid-up Capital, £846,665.

Reserve Fund, £460,000.

DIRECTORS.

WILLIAM JAMES THOMPSON, Esq., Chairman.
EDMUND THEODORE DOXAT, Esq.
WILLIAM FOWLER, Esq.
WILLIAM HANCOCK, Esq.

Auditors: JAMES MORTON BELL, Esq.; JOSEPH ROBERT MORRISON, Esq.; JOSEPH GURNEY FOWLER, Esq. (Messrs. Price, Waterhouse, & Co.). Manager: CHARLES HENRY HUTCHINS, Esq. Sub-Manager: LEWIS BEAUMONT, Esq. Secretary: CHARLES WOOLLEY, Esq.

QUINTIN HOGG, Esq.
JOHN FRANCIS OGILVY, Esq.
AUGUSTUS SILLEM, Esq.

Approved Mercantile Bills Discounted. Loans granted upon Negotiable Securities. Money received on Deposit, at Call and Short Notice, at the Current Market Rates, and for Longer Periods upon Terms to be Specially Agreed upon.

Investments in and Sales of all descriptions of British and Foreign Securities effected.

